arXiv:1409.0741v2 [math.AG] 3 Sep 2014

Operations and poly-operations in Algebraic Cobordism

Alexander Vishik*

Abstract

We describe all operations from a theory A^* obtained from Algebraic Cobordism Ω^* of M.Levine-F.Morel by change of coefficients to any oriented cohomology theory B^*. We prove that such an operation can be reconstructed out of it's action on the products of projective spaces. This reduces the construction of operations to algebra and extends the additive case done in [13], as well as the topological one obtained by T.Kashiwabara - see [4]. The key new ingredients which permit us to treat the non-additive operations are: the use of poly-operations and the "Discrete Taylor expansion". As an application we construct the only missing, the 0-th (non-additive) Symmetric operation, for arbitrary p - see [14], which permits to sharpen some results on the structure of the Algebraic Cobordism - see [15].

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Theories of rational type **3**
2.1 The bi-complex* $\mathfrak{c}$. 3
2.2 Divisor classes and refined pull-backs 5

3 Discrete Taylor expansion **7**

4 Operations and poly-operations **8**

5 Main result **9**
5.1 Transformations on products of projective spaces 10
5.2 Condition $\mathbf{G}(d)$ 12
5.3 Reduction to the case of mono-operations 12
5.4 Induction step 13

6 Non-additive Symmetric operations **25**

1 Introduction

In Topology, the notion of a generalized cohomology theory was introduced and applied with great success to provide invariants for topological spaces. This permitted to answer various old questions and to enhance the topological world with a lot of structure.

In algebraic geometry the respective development was lagging behind. Although such algebro-geometric cohomology theory, as *algebraic K-theory*, preceded it's topological counterpart, for a long

*School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Nottingham

time, it was one of the few theories available in the algebraic context. Another notable exception was the *Chow groups*.

The situation changed dramatically with the works of V.Voevodsky in the 1990's who brought effective topological methods into algebraic geometry and introduced the *motivic category* - [16] which provides the natural environment for *motivic cohomology* - an algebro-geometric version of singular cohomology (earlier constructed by S.Bloch in the form of *higher Chow groups* - [1]), and together with F.Morel defined the $\mathbb{A}^1$-*homotopic category* - [7] which permitted to treat algebraic variety with the same flexibility as topological spaces. This provided the necessary tools for the construction of the generalized cohomology theories, and such theories, as well as cohomological operations on them, played a crucial role in the proof of Milnor's and Bloch-Kato conjectures by V.Voevodsky and M.Rost-V.Voevodsky.

The algebro-geometric homotopic world is more complex than the topological one. This is manifested by the presence of two natural independent "suspensions" (1) and [1] which makes algebro-geometric homology groups numbered by two numbers. The groups related to the direction (1)[2] behave generally better and have substantially simpler geometric interpretation. This is the, so-called, *pure part of the theory*. In the case of motivic cohomology $\mathrm{H}^{*,*'}_{\mathcal{M}}$, these are classical Chow groups CH^*. At the same time, such a "pure part" is sufficient for many purposes, so it would be useful to have tools which would permit to work with the "pure part" alone. One of the main quests here was to find an "elementary" construction of the pure part of the universal theory - the $\mathrm{MGL}^{*,*'}$ of V.Voevodsky (an algebro-geometric analogue of the complex-oriented cobordism MU^* in topology). This problem was solved by M.Levine and F.Morel who constructed Ω^* - the *algebraic cobordism of Levine-Morel* [6] (see also [5] and [3]) .

The theory Ω^* is very rich, and the classical theories of Chow groups and K_0 can be both obtained from it by simple change of coefficients, and so are small "faces" of this theory. Thus, we get a much "larger" invariant of algebraic varieties. But to work with such an invariant one needs some structure on it. The structure is provided by cohomological operations. The most important among them - the *stable* operations of Landweber-Novikov were constructed in [6] (using [9], see also [8],[10]). But it was observed (see [11]) that to treat the torsion effects one needs more subtle *unstable* operations. No general methods of constructing such operations in algebro-geometric context were available up to recently. The solution was found in [13], where the notion of a *theory of rational type* was introduced. For such a theory, $A^*(X)$ permits a description inductive on the dimension of X, and these appear to be exactly the theories obtained from algebraic cobordism of Levine-Morel Ω^* by change of coefficients. In [13] the *additive* cohomological operations from a theory of rational type elsewhere were classified. It was shown that such an operation is completely determined and can be reconstructed from it's action on products of projective spaces. This provides an effective tool in constructing operations, since everything is reduced to defining a set of power series satisfying certain conditions (that is, to "algebra"). At the same time, the methods of [13] permitted to treat the additive case only, as the proof used many formulas involving sums.

In the current paper we extend the methods of [13] to the case of arbitrary (non-additive) operations. The new ingredients which permitted this are: the *Discrete Taylor Expansion* - the method of describing non-additive maps between additive objects, and the use of *poly-operations*. As in the additive case of [13] we prove that operations from a theory of rational type elsewhere are in 1-to-1 correspondence with transformations on the category $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ whose objects are $(\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l}$, for all l, and morphisms are generated by: the action of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_l$, the partial projections, the partial diagonals, the partial point embeddings, and the partial Segre embeddings (the only natural maps you can write) - see Theorem 5.1. The topological variant of this result was obtained by T.Kashiwabara in [4, Theorem 4.2]. We actually prove a more general poly-operational case of this statement (Theorem 5.2). The use of poly-operations is really essential, as we extend our operation from $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ to $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ by induction on the dimension d of varieties, and the induction step goes only for all poly-operations (of arbitrary foldness!) simultaneously.

As an application, we construct the 0-th non-additive *Symmetric operation* for arbitrary p (for $p = 2$ such an operation was constructed in [12] by an explicit geometric construction) - see [14]. This completes the construction of a *Total Symmetric operation* and permits to sharpen some results on the structure of algebraic cobordism. Namely, we show - see [15] that $\Omega^*(X)$ as a module over the Lazard ring $\mathbb{L}$ has relations in positive codimension. This extends the result of M.Levine and F.Morel claiming that this module has generators in non-negative codimension - see [6], and also computes the algebraic cobordism ring of a curve.

2 Theories of rational type

Definition 2.1 *Under the term "oriented cohomology theory" we will understand any "small theory", i.e. any theory on* $\mathbf{Sm_k}$ *satisfying the axioms of [13, Definition 2.1] which are the standard axioms of [6, Definition 1.1.2] plus the localization axiom:*

(*LOC*) *For a smooth quasi-projective variety X with closed subscheme $Z \xrightarrow{i} X$ and open complement $U \xrightarrow{j} X$, one has an exact sequence:*

$$A_*(Z) \xrightarrow{i_*} A_*(X) \xrightarrow{j^*} A_*(U) \to 0,$$

where $A_*(Z) := \lim_{V \to Z} A_*(V)$ - the limit taken over all projective maps from smooth varieties to Z, and for a d-dimensional variety T, $A_*(T) := A^{d-*}(T)$.

We will be mostly interested in, so-called, "constant" theories. (cf. [6, Definition 4.4.1]):

(*CONST*) *The theory is called "constant" if the natural map $A^*(k) \to A^*(L)$ is an isomorphism, for each finitely generated field extension L/k,*

where, following M.Levine and F.Morel ([6, Subsection 4.4.1]), we define $A^*(L)$ as $colim_{U \subset X} A^*(U)$ where U runs over all open subsets of some smooth model X with $k(X) = L$ (recall, that we are in characteristic zero, so all field extensions are separable).

For a *constant theory* we have a natural splitting:

$$A^* = A \oplus \overline{A}^*$$

into a constant part and elements supported in positive codimension.

2.1 The bi-complex* $\mathfrak{c}$.

It appears that any theory $A^* = \Omega^* \otimes_{\mathbb{L}} A$ obtained from Algebraic Cobordism of Levine-Morel by change of coefficients satisfies some additional strong condition. This is what we call a "theory of rational type" - see [13, Definition 4.1] and [13, Proposition 4.9].

Consider the following *resolution category* $\mathcal{RC}(X)$ of X. Objects of $\mathcal{RC}(X)$ are diagrams $Z \xrightarrow{z} X \xleftarrow{\rho} \widetilde{X}$, where z is an embedding of a closed proper subscheme, and ρ is a projective birational morphism, which is an isomorphism outside Z and such that $V = \rho^{-1}(Z)$ is a divisor with strict normal crossing.

Morphisms are commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z_2 & \xrightarrow{z_2} & X & \xleftarrow{\rho_2} & \widetilde{X}_2 \\ {\scriptstyle i}\downarrow & & \| & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} \\ Z_1 & \xrightarrow[z_1]{} & X & \xleftarrow[\rho_1]{} & \widetilde{X}_1. \end{array} \tag{1}$$

Among these we will distinguish ones of especially simple kind:

type I: $i = id$, π is a single blow-up over V_1 permitted w.r.to V_1;

type II: $\pi = id$.

We will denote respective morphisms as $\mathcal{M}or_I$ and $\mathcal{M}or_{II}$, respectively. Note, that for morphisms of type I, $\pi^{-1}(V_1) = V_2$.

Consider also the category $\mathcal{RC}^1(X)$ of diagrams $Z \xrightarrow{z} X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \xleftarrow{\rho} \widetilde{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}$, where z is an embedding of a closed subscheme, and ρ is projective birational map, isomorphic outside Z, where $W = \rho^{-1}(Z)$ is a divisor with strict normal crossing having no components over 0 and 1, such that the preimages $\widetilde{X}_0 = \rho^{-1}(X \times 0)$ and $\widetilde{X}_1 = \rho^{-1}(X \times 1)$ are smooth divisors on $\widetilde{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}$, and such that $W \cap \widetilde{X}_0 \hookrightarrow \widetilde{X}_0$ and $W \cap \widetilde{X}_1 \hookrightarrow \widetilde{X}_1$ are divisors with strict normal crossing. Morphisms can be defined in the same way as for $\mathcal{RC}(X)$, but we will not need them.

We have maps $\partial_0, \partial_1 : Ob(\mathcal{RC}^1(X)) \to Ob(\mathcal{RC}(X))$ defined by:

$$\partial_l(Z \xrightarrow{z} X \times \mathbb{P}^1 \xleftarrow{\rho} \widetilde{X \times \mathbb{P}^1}) = (Z_l \xrightarrow{z_l} X \xleftarrow{\rho} \widetilde{X}_l),$$

where $Z_l = (X \times \{l\}) \cap Z$.

Consider the bi-complex* $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{c}(A^*)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} c_{1,0} & \xrightarrow{d_{1,0}} & c_{0,0} \\ & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle d_{0,1}} \\ & & c_{0,1} \end{array}$$

(such a "small" bi-complex will be called a *bi-complex**), where

- $c_{0,0} := \bigoplus_{Ob(\mathcal{RC}(X))} A_*(V) \cap im(\rho^!)$, where $\rho^! : A_*(Z) \to A_*(V)$ is the refined pull-back;
- $c_{1,0} := \left(\bigoplus_{\mathcal{M}or_I} A_*(V_1) \cap im(\rho^!) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{\mathcal{M}or_{II}} A_*(V_2) \cap im(\rho^!) \right)$ - see (1);
- $c_{0,1} := \bigoplus_{Ob(\mathcal{RC}^1(X))} A_{*+1}(W) \cap im(\rho^!)$.

and the differentials are defined as follows:

- $d^I_{1,0}(\mathcal{V}_2 \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{V}_1, x) = (\mathcal{V}_2, (\pi_V(f))^!(x)) - (\mathcal{V}_1, x)$ and
  $d^{II}_{1,0}(\mathcal{V}_2 \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{V}_1, y) = (\mathcal{V}_2, y) - (\mathcal{V}_1, (i_V(f))_*(y))$.
- $d_{0,1}(\mathcal{U}, \sum_S z_s) = (\partial_0\mathcal{U}, \sum_S i_1^\star(z_s)) - (\partial_1\mathcal{U}, \sum_S i_0^\star(z_s))$.

We have:

Theorem 2.2 ([13, Theorem 4.33]) *Let $A^* = \Omega^* \otimes_{\mathbb{L}} A$. Then we have the natural identification:*

$$H(\mathfrak{c}) = \overline{A}^*$$

defined by: $(V \xrightarrow{v} \widetilde{X} \xrightarrow{\rho} X, \gamma) \mapsto \frac{\rho_* v_*(\gamma)}{\rho_*(1)}$.

This permits to describe such a theory inductively on the dimension of X.

2.2 Divisor classes and refined pull-backs

Recall that a strict normal crossing divisor $D = \sum_{I_0 \in L} l_{I_0} \cdot D_{I_0}$ has a *divisor class* $[D] \in A^0(D)$ such that $d_*([D]) = c_1^A(\mathcal{O}(D)) \in A^1(X)$. Having $\lambda_{I_0} = c_1^A(\mathcal{O}(D_{I_0}))$, the idea is to write the "formal sum" $\sum_{I_0 \in L}^A [l_{I_0}] \cdot_A \lambda_{I_0}$ as $\sum_{I_1 \subset L} (\prod_{I_0 \in I_1} \lambda_{I_0}) \cdot F_{I_1}^{l_{I_0}; I_0 \in L}(\overline{\lambda})$, where $F_{J_1}^{l_{I_0}; I_0 \in L}$ is some power series with A-coefficients, and then define:

Definition 2.3 ([6, Definition 3.1.5])

$$[D] := \sum_{I_1 \subset L} (\hat{d}_{I_1})_*(1) \cdot F_{I_1}^{l_{I_0}; I_0 \in L}(\overline{\lambda}),$$

where $\hat{d}_{I_1} : D_{I_1} = \cap_{I_0 \in I_1} D_{I_0} \to |D|$ is the closed embedding.

The result does not depend on how you subdivide the above formal sum into pieces, but there is some standard way. The convention is (see [6, Subsection 3.1]) to define $F_{I_1}^{l_{I_0}; I_0 \in L}$ as the sum of those monomials which are made exactly of λ_{I_0}, $I_0 \in I_1$ divided by the $(\prod_{I_0 \in I_1} \lambda_{I_0})$.

Due to the results of M.Levine-F.Morel from [6] we have a structure of refined pull-backs for l.c.i. morphisms for Algebraic Cobordism theory Ω^*, and so, for any theory obtained from it by change of coefficients. In the case of strict normal crossing divisors such maps can be described in an explicit combinatorial way.

Definition 2.4 *Having a divisor $D = \sum_{I_0 \in L} l_{I_0} \cdot D_{I_0}$ with strict normal crossing on X, we can define the pull-back:*

$$d^\star : A_*(X) \to A_{*-1}(D)$$

by the formula

$$d^\star(x) = \sum_{I_1 \subset L} (\hat{d}_{I_1})_* d_{I_1}^*(x) \cdot F_{I_1}^{l_{I_0}; I_0 \in L}(\overline{\lambda}),$$

where $d_{I_1} : D_{I_1} \to X$ is the regular embedding of the I_1-st face of D.

Notice, that such a pull-back clearly depends on the multiplicity of the components. Also, since for $I_1' \subset I_1$, for $d_{I_1/I_1'} : D_{I_1} \to D_{I_1'}$, we have: $(d_{I_1/I_1'})_*(1) = \prod_{I_0 \in I_1 \setminus I_1'} \lambda_{I_0}$, the projection formula shows that it does not matter, how one chooses the $F_{I_1}^{l_{I_0}; I_0 \in L}$ (in particular, one can choose these to be zero for $\#(I_1) > 1$).

Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{e} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle \overline{f}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ D & \xrightarrow[d]{} & X. \end{array} \tag{2}$$

be a Cartesian square, where X and Y are smooth and $D \xrightarrow{d} X$ and $E \xrightarrow{e} Y$ are divisors with strict normal crossing (closed codimension 1 subschemes given by principal ideals whose *div* is a strict normal crossing divisor). Then we can define:

$$\overline{f}^\star : A^*(D) \to A^*(E)$$

as follows. Suppose, $D = \sum_{I_0 \in L} l_{I_0} \cdot D_{I_0}$, $E = \sum_{J_0 \in M} m_{J_0} \cdot E_{J_0}$, where D_{I_0} and E_{J_0} are irreducible components; $\lambda_{I_0} = c_1^A(\mathcal{O}(D_{I_0}))$, $\mu_{J_0} = c_1^A(\mathcal{O}(E_{J_0}))$, and $f^*(D_{I_0}) = \sum_{J_0 \in M} p_{I_0,J_0} \cdot E_{J_0}$. Notice, that if $p_{I_0,J_0} \neq 0$, for some I_0 and J_0, then we have the natural map $f_{J_0,I_0} : E_{J_0} \to D_{I_0}$, and so the map

$f_{J_1,I_0} : E_{J_1} \to D_{I_0}$, for any $J_1 \ni J_0$. Assume that $F_{J_1}^{p_{I_0,J_0};J_0\in M} = 0$, if $p_{I_0,J_0} = 0$, for at least one $J_0 \in J_1$ (notice, that there are no monomials divisible by μ_{J_1} in the $\sum_{J_0\in M}^{A}[p_{I_0,J_0}] \cdot_A \mu_{J_0}$, so any "reasonable" choice will do).

Definition 2.5 *Let $x = \sum_{I_0}(\hat{d}_{I_0})_*(x_{I_0})$, for some $x_{I_0} \in A^*(D_{I_0})$. Define:*

$$\overline{f}^\star(x) := \sum_{I_0\in L}\sum_{J_1\subset M}(\hat{e}_{J_1})_* f^*_{J_1,I_0}(x_{I_0}) \cdot F_{J_1}^{p_{I_0,J_0};J_0\in M}(\overline{\mu}) \in A^*(E),$$

where we ignore the terms with the zero $F_{J_1}^{p_{I_0,J_0};J_0\in M}$.

Again, , since for $J_1' \subset J_1$, for $e_{J_1/J_1'} : E_{J_1} \to E_{J_1'}$, we have: $(e_{J_1/J_1'})_*(1) = \prod_{J_0\in J_1\setminus J_1'}\mu_{J_0}$, the projection formula shows that it does not matter, how we choose the $F_{J_1}^{p_{I_0,J_0};J_0\in M}$.

It follows from [13, Lemma 7.19] that the above maps are just "refined pull-backs" $d^!$ and $f^!$ of M.Levine-F.Morel (see [6, Section 6]).

The above combinatorial pull-backs satisfy some sort of "excess intersection formula" - see [13, Proposition 7.20], which (in the generality we use here) is just a particular case of [6, Theorem 6.6.6(2)(a)].

Proposition 2.6 (Multiple points excess intersection formula)
Let A^* be a theory satisfying $(CONST)$. Then, in the above situation, we have:

(1)
$$e_* \circ \overline{f}^\star = f^* \circ d_*.$$

(2) *Suppose, f is projective. Then*
$$\overline{f}_* \circ e^\star = d^\star \circ f_*.$$

We also have the usual Excess Intersection Formula - see [12, Theorem 5.19] and [6, Theorem 6.6.9]. Consider cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{f'} & Z \\ {\scriptstyle g'}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle g} \\ Y & \xrightarrow[f]{} & X \end{array}$$

with f, f' - regular embeddings, and $(g')^*(\mathcal{N}_{Y\subset X})/\mathcal{N}_{W\subset Z} =: \mathcal{M}$ the vector bundle of dimension d.

Proposition 2.7 *Let A^* be any theory in the sense of Definition 2.1. In the above situation,*

$$g^* f_*(v) = f'_*(c_d^A(\mathcal{M}) \cdot (g')^*(v));$$

If g is projective, then also:

$$f^* g_*(u) = g'_*(c_d^A(\mathcal{M}) \cdot (f')^*(u)).$$

Finally, we will need some formulas related to the regular (consecutive) blow-up morphism.

Proposition 2.8 ([13, Proposition 7.6]) *Let A^* be any generalized oriented cohomology theory in the sense of Definition 2.1, and $\rho : \widetilde{X} \to X$ be the permitted blow up of a smooth variety with smooth centers R_i and the respective components of the exceptional divisor $E_i \stackrel{\varepsilon_i}{\to} R_i$. Then one has exact sequences:*

(1) $$0 \leftarrow A_*(X) \xleftarrow{\rho_*} A_*(\widetilde{X}) \longleftarrow \oplus_i \operatorname{Ker}(A_*(E_i) \stackrel{(\varepsilon_i)_*}{\to} A_*(R_i)).$$

(2) $$0 \to A^*(X) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} A^*(\widetilde{X}) \longrightarrow \oplus_i \operatorname{Coker}(A^*(R_i) \stackrel{(\varepsilon_i)^*}{\to} A^*(E_i))$$

3 Discrete Taylor expansion

How to work with non-additive maps between additive objects? We need some sort of "calculus".

Definition 3.1 *Let $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ be a map between abelian groups. Define $\eth f : A \times A \to B$ by the formula:*

$$\eth f(a_1, a_2) := f(a_1 + a_2) - f(a_1) - f(a_2).$$

This derivative is trivial if and only if the map is additive.

Define $\eth^q f$ inductively as $\eth \eth^{q-1} f$ (where, from symmetry, it does not matter to which coordinate we apply $\eth$). We get a symmetric function $\eth^q f : A^{\times(q+1)} \to B$. We also set $\eth^{-1} f : A^{\times 0} \to B$ to be the zero element of B.

Let M_0 be a finite set. Define the collection of sets M_i inductively by the formula: $M_i := 2^{M_{i-1}}$, and $\overline{M}_i = M_i \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ (for $i \geqslant 1$). We have a map $Supp : M_i \to M_{i-1}$ defined by: $Supp(J_i) = \cup_{J_{i-1} \in J_i} J_{i-1}$. Suppose, x_{J_0}, $J_0 \in M_0$ are elements of A, then we have:

Proposition 3.2 (Discrete Taylor Expansion)

$$f\left(\sum_{J_0 \in M_0} x_{J_0}\right) = \sum_{J_1 \in M_1} (\eth^{|J_1|-1} f)(x_{J_0}|_{J_0 \in J_1}).$$

The behavior of Taylor expansions under the composition of maps is described by the Chain Rule. Let

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{g} C$$

be two composable maps between abelian groups. Then

$$(g \circ f)\left(\sum_{J_0 \in M_0} x_{J_0}\right) = g\left(\sum_{J_1 \in M_1} (\eth^{|J_1|-1} f)(x_{J_0}|_{J_0 \in J_1})\right) =$$
$$\sum_{J_2 \in M_2} (\eth^{|J_2|-1} g)\left((\eth^{|J_1|-1} f)(x_{J_0}|_{J_0 \in J_1})|_{J_1 \in J_2}\right).$$

On the other hand,

$$(g \circ f)\left(\sum_{J_0 \in M_0} x_{J_0}\right) = \sum_{J_1 \in M_1} (\eth^{|J_1|-1}(g \circ f))(x_{J_0}|_{J_0 \in J_1}).$$

Taking into account that this is some universal identity (valid for all A, B, C, f, g), we obtain:

Proposition 3.3 (Discrete Chain Rule)

$$(\eth^{|J_1|-1}(g \circ f))(x_{J_0}|_{J_0 \in J_1}) = \sum_{\substack{J_2 \in M_2 \\ Supp(J_2) = J_1}} (\eth^{|J_2|-1} g)\left((\eth^{|J_1'|-1} f)(x_{J_0}|_{J_0 \in J_1'})|_{J_1' \in J_2}\right).$$

If $A' \subset A$ is a subgroup, then the map $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ can be lifted to a map $A/A' \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} B$ if and only if $\eth f(A', A) = 0$.

Similarly, if we have a poly-map $\times_{i=1}^r A_i \xrightarrow{f} B$, and subgroups $A_i' \subset A_i$, then it can be lifted to a poly-map $\times_{i=1}^r A_i/A_i' \xrightarrow{\overline{f}} B$ if and only if the i-th simple partial derivative $\eth_{(i)}$ vanishes on $A_i' \times (\times_{j \neq i} A_j)$, for all $i \in \overline{r} = \{1, \ldots, r\}$.

4 Operations and poly-operations

Definition 4.1 *Let A^* and B^* be cohomology theories in the sense of Definition 2.1. Under an operation $A^* \stackrel{G}{\to} B^*$ we will understand a morphism of (contravariant) functors, that is, a transformation commuting with all pull-back maps.*

Notice, that here we do not require 0 to be sent to 0, as in [13, Definition 3.3]. This condition appears in connection with the notion of stability, but it is convenient to drop it in the current context (the only case interesting to us is that of non-additive, and so unstable operations).

Consider the functor $\mathbf{Sm_k}^{\times r} \stackrel{\prod^r}{\to} \mathbf{Sm_k}$.

Definition 4.2 *Let $A_i^*; i \in \overline{r}$ and B^* be cohomology theories in the sense of Definition 2.1.*

- *Under an r-nary (internal) poly-operation we will understand an operation $\times_{i=1}^r A_i^* \stackrel{\hat{H}}{\to} B^*$ on $\mathbf{Sm_k}$.*
- *Under an r-nary (external) poly-operation we will understand the morphism of (contravariant) functors $(\times_{i=1}^r A_i^*) \stackrel{H}{\to} B^* \circ (\prod^r)$ on $\mathbf{Sm_k}^{\times r}$.*
  In other words, for all r-tuples of smooth quasi-projective varieties $X_i; i \in \overline{r}$ we have a map: $\times_{i=1}^r A_i^*(X_i) \stackrel{H}{\to} B^*(\times_{i=1}^r X_i)$ commuting with the pull-backs for $\times_{i=1}^r X_i \stackrel{\times_{i=1}^r f_i}{\to} \times_{i=1}^r Y_i$.

The following diagram of functors (and morphisms of functors) permits to identify the sets of (external) and (internal) poly-operations.



Namely, restricting the (external) poly-operation H along the functor Δ and composing it (on the left) with the the morphism of functors Δ we obtain an (internal) poly-operation $\hat{H}$:

$$(\times_{i=1}^r A_i^*)(X) \stackrel{\Delta^*(H)}{\longrightarrow} B^*(X^{\times r}) \stackrel{\Delta^*}{\longrightarrow} B^*(X).$$

Conversely, restricting the (internal) poly-operation $\hat{H}$ along the functor $\prod^r$ and composing it (on the left) with the morphism of functors $\times_{i=1}^r \pi_i^*$ we get an (external) poly-operation H:

$$\times_{i=1}^r A_i^*(X_i) \stackrel{\times \pi_i^*}{\longrightarrow} (\times_{i=1}^r A_i^*)(\prod_{i=1}^r X_i) \stackrel{\hat{H}}{\longrightarrow} B^*(\prod_{i=1}^r X_i).$$

This provides a 1-to-1 correspondence between (internal) and (external) poly-operations.

Notice, that although the notions of (external) and (internal) poly-operations are equivalent on the whole category $\mathbf{Sm_k}$, this will not be so if we restrict the dimension d of our varieties. Below we prove our main result by the induction on the dimension, and the proper tool in this situation will be provided by the (external) poly-operations.

The most well-known example of a poly-operation is given by the *multiplication bi-operation*:

$$A^* \times A^* \stackrel{\cdot}{\longrightarrow} A^*.$$

Poly-operations naturally appear as "discrete derivatives" of operations: given an operation $A^* \stackrel{G}{\to} B^*$, we can produce the (external) bi-operation

$$A^*(X_1) \times A^*(X_2) \stackrel{\eth G}{\to} B^*(X_1 \times X_2)$$

by the rule: $\eth G(x,y) = G(\pi_1^*(x) + \pi_2^*(y)) - G(\pi_1^*(x)) - G(\pi_2^*(y))$. Analogously, one obtains the (external) poly-operation: $\eth^q G : \times^{(q+1)}(A^*) \to B^* \circ (\prod^r)$, and the respective (internal) poly-operation $\partial^q G : (\times^{(q+1)} A^*) \to B^*$. We have analogues of Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 in this situation.

5 Main result

Theorem 5.1 *Let A^* be a theory of rational type, and B^* be any theory in the sense of Definition 2.1. Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then operations $A^n \stackrel{G}{\to} B^m$ on $\mathbf{Sm_k}$ are in 1-to-1 correspondence with the transformations*

$$A^n((\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l}) \stackrel{G}{\to} B^m((\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l}),\ \textit{for } l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$$

commuting with the pull-backs for:

(*i*) *the action of $\mathfrak{S}_l$;*

(*ii*) *the partial diagonals;*

(*iii*) *the partial Segre embeddings;*

(*iv*) *the partial point embeddings;*

(*v*) *the partial projections.*

The topological analogue of this result was obtained by T.Kashiwabara in [4, Theorem 4.2]. The additive algebro-geometric case was done in [13, Theorem 5.1].

We will prove a poly-operational version (which, in reality, is equivalent).

Theorem 5.2 *Let r be a natural number, $A_i^*; i \in \overline{r}$ be theories of rational type, and B^* be any theory in the sense of Definition 2.1. Fix $n_i; i \in \overline{r}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then r-nary (external) poly-operations $\times_{i=1}^r (A_i^{n_i}) \stackrel{H}{\to} B^m \circ (\prod^r)$ on $\mathbf{Sm_k}^{\times r}$ are in 1-to-1 correspondence with the r-nary (external) poly-transformations*

$$\times_{i=1}^r A_i^{n_i}((\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l_i}) \stackrel{H}{\to} B^m(\times_{i=1}^r (\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l_i}),\ \textit{for } l_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$$

commuting with the pull-backs for:

(*i*) *the action of $\times_{i=1}^r \mathfrak{S}_{l_i}$;*

(*ii*) *the partial diagonals (for each i);*

(*iii*) *the partial Segre embeddings (for each i);*

(*iv*) *the partial point embeddings (for each i);*

(*v*) *the partial projections (for each i).*

5.1 Transformations on products of projective spaces

Let

$$A((\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l}) \stackrel{G}{\to} B((\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l}), \text{ for } l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$$

be any transformation satisfying $(i)-(v)$. Subtracting $G(0)$ if needed, we can assume that $G(0) = 0$. Denote: $A[[\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}]] := A[[z^A_1, \dots, z^A_l]]$, and $B[[\overline{z}^B_{\{l\}}]] := B[[z^B_1, \dots, z^B_l]]$. Identifying $C((\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l})$ with $C[[\overline{z}^C_{\{l\}}]]$, we get a map

$$G_{\{l\}} : A[[\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}]] \to B[[\overline{z}^B_{\{l\}}]].$$

Our conditions can be interpreted as follows: for any $\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}) \in A[[\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}]]$,

(i) $G_{\{l\}}$ is symmetric w.r.to $\mathfrak{S}_l$ (with the diagonal action on two sets of variables);

(ii) $G_{\{l\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l-1\}}, z^B_{l-1}) = G_{\{l-1\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l-1\}}, z^A_{l-1}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l-1\}})$;

(iii) $G_{\{l\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l-1\}}, z^B_l +_B z^B_{l+1}) = G_{\{l+1\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l-1\}}, z^A_l +_A z^A_{l+1}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l+1\}})$;

(iv) $G_{\{l\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l-1\}}, 0) = G_{\{l-1\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l-1\}}, 0))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l-1\}})$;

(v) $G_{\{l\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l\}}) = G_{\{l+1\}}(\alpha(\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}))(\overline{z}^B_{\{l+1\}})$.

Using the last property, we can combine all $G_{\{l\}}$'s together. Consider $A[[\overline{z}^A]] = \cup_l A[[\overline{z}^A_{\{l\}}]]$ and $B[[\overline{z}^B]] = \cup_l B[[\overline{z}^B_{\{l\}}]]$. On these rings we have an action of $\mathfrak{S}_\infty = \cup_l \mathfrak{S}_l$, where the group $\mathfrak{S}_l$ acts on the first l variables. Denote as $\overline{z}^A_{+r}$ the variables $z^A_{r+1}, z^A_{r+2}, \dots$ (and similar for B). Denote as $\mathrm{Hom}_{Filt}(A[[\overline{z}^A]], B[[\overline{z}^B]])$ the set of maps respecting the above filtration. Then $G_{\{l\}}$'s give rise to the

$$G \in \mathrm{Hom}_{Filt}(A[[\overline{z}^A]], B[[\overline{z}^B]])$$

satisfying the following: For any $\alpha(\overline{z}^A) \in A[[\overline{z}^A]]$,

(a_i) G is symmetric w. r. to $\mathfrak{S}_\infty$;

(a_{ii}) $G(\alpha(\overline{z}^A))(0, \overline{z}^B_{+1}) = G(\alpha(0, \overline{z}^A_{+1}))(\overline{z}^B)$;

(a_{iii}) $G(\alpha(\overline{z}^A))(z^B_1 +_B z^B_2, z^B_3, \dots) = G(\alpha(z^A_1 +_A z^A_2, z^A_3, \dots))(\overline{z}^B)$;

(a_{iv}) $G(\alpha(\overline{z}^A))(z^B_2, \overline{z}^B_{+1}) = G(\alpha(z^A_2, \overline{z}^A_{+1}))(\overline{z}^B_{+1})$.

Thus, we have identified the set of transformations on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ with the set of G's as above.

From symmetry it follows that it does not really matter how we call particular variables, so sometimes we will use different letters to denote some of them. The important thing though is to keep parity between A and B-coordinates, like: x^A - x^B, y^A - y^B.

Our map G appear to be continuous, in some sense. It follows from $(a_{ii}), (a_i)$, and (a_{iv}) that, for any monomial ideal $\langle(\overline{z}^A)^{\overline{d}}\rangle$, we have:

$$G(\langle(\overline{z}^A)^{\overline{d}}\rangle) \subset \langle(\overline{z}^B)^{\overline{d}}\rangle. \tag{3}$$

In a similar fashion, an r-nary (external) poly-transformation H on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^{\times r}$ is given by

$$H \in \mathrm{Hom}_{Filt}(\times_{i=1}^r A_i[[\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)]], B[[\overline{z}^B(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}]])$$

satisfying the following: For any $\alpha_i(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)) \in A_i[[\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)]]$; $i \in \overline{r}$,

(a_i) H is symmetric w. r. to $\times_{i=1}^{r}\mathfrak{S}_\infty$;

and, for each i,

(a_{ii})

$$H\left(\alpha_i(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)),\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(0,\overline{z}^B_{+1}(i),\overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right)=$$
$$H\left(\alpha_i(0,\overline{z}^{A_i}_{+1}(i)),\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(\overline{z}^B(i),\overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right);$$

(a_{iii})

$$H\left(\alpha_i(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)),\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(z^B_1(i)+_B z^B_2(i),z^B_3(i),\dots,\overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right)=$$
$$H\left(\alpha_i\big(z^{A_i}_1(i)+_{A_i} z^{A_i}_2(i),z^{A_i}_3(i),\dots\big),\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(\overline{z}^B(i),\overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right);$$

(a_{iv})

$$H\left(\alpha_i(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)),\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(z^B_2(i),\overline{z}^B_{+1}(i),\overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right)=$$
$$H\left(\alpha_i(z^{A_i}_2(i),\overline{z}^{A_i}_{+1}(i)),\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(\overline{z}^B_{+1}(i),\overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right).$$

In particular, it again follows from $(a_i),(a_{ii})$, and (a_{iv}) that if $H\left(0,\alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)=0$, for all i, then, for any choice of monomials $(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i))^{\overline{d(i)}};i\in\overline{r}$,

$$H(\langle(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i))^{\overline{d(i)}}\rangle|_{i\in\overline{r}})\subset\langle\prod_{i=1}^{r}(\overline{z}^B(i))^{\overline{d(i)}}\rangle. \tag{4}$$

And, for the respective (internal) poly-operation $\hat{H}$, one has:

$$\hat{H}(\langle(\overline{z}^{A_i})^{\overline{d(i)}}\rangle|_{i\in\overline{r}})\subset\langle(\overline{z}^B)^{\sum_{i=1}^{r}\overline{d(i)}}\rangle. \tag{5}$$

Let $A^*\stackrel{G}{\to}B^*$ be a transformation on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ such that $G(0)=0$. Then $\eth G:A^*\times A^*\to B^*$ is an (external) bi-transformation on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^2$ such that $\eth G(0,*)=\eth G(*,0)=0$. Hence, if $y\in\langle(\overline{z}^A)^{\overline{d}}\rangle$, then $\partial G(x,y)\in\langle(\overline{z}^B)^{\overline{d}}\rangle$. Since $G(x+y)=G(x)+G(y)+\partial G(x,y)$, we get:

Proposition 5.3 *For any transformation $A^*\stackrel{G}{\to}B^*$ on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ such that $G(0)=0$,*

$$\{x\equiv x'\ (\,mod\,\langle(\overline{z}^A)^{\overline{d}}\rangle)\}\quad\Rightarrow\quad\{G(x)\equiv G(x')\ (\,mod\,\langle(\overline{z}^B)^{\overline{d}}\rangle)\}.$$

In other words, G is continuous in the topology given by the monomial ideals, and we can approximate $G(x)$ by approximating x. Similar result is valid for poly-operations.

For $\alpha(\overline{z}^A)=\sum_{\overline{d}\in M}\alpha_{\overline{d}}\cdot(\overline{z}^A)^{\overline{d}}$, as in Proposition 3.2, we have:

$$G(\alpha(\overline{z}^A))=\sum_{I\subset M}(\partial^{|I|-1}G)\left(\alpha_{\overline{d}}\cdot(\overline{z}^A)^{\overline{d}}|_{\overline{d}\in I}\right),$$

where the sum is taken over all finite subsets of the set of all monomials M. Despite the fact that M is infinite now, it follows from (5) that the sum converges.

In the same way, we can expand an (external) poly-operation along each variable.

5.2 Condition $\mathbf{G}(d)$

Definition 5.4 *Suppose, X is smooth quasi-projective variety. Let us say that $\mathbf{G}(X)$ is defined if we are given $G_X \in \mathrm{Hom}_{Filt}(A^*(X)[[\overline{z}^A]], B^*(X)[[\overline{z}^B]])$ satisfying $(a_i), (a_{ii}), (a_{iii}), (a_{iv})$.*

Denote as $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ the category with objects: $(\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times l}$, for $l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$, and morphisms generated by: the action of the symmetric group, partial diagonals, partial projections, partial point embeddings, and partial Segre embeddings. Denote as $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d}$ be the full subcategory of $\mathbf{Sm_k}$ consisting of varieties of dimension $\leqslant d$. For different varieties, the $\mathbf{G}(X)$-structures should interact. To start with, altogether they should provide an operation on $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$. But, it appears, that one needs to carry along some Riemann-Roch type condition as well.

Definition 5.5 *Let d be a non-negative integer. Let us say that $\mathbf{G}(d)$ is defined, if for all X of dimension $\leqslant d$, $\mathbf{G}(X)$ is defined and it satisfies:*

(b_i) *For any $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ (with $\dim(X), \dim(Y) \leqslant d$),*

$$G_X(f^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)) = f^* G_Y(\alpha(\overline{z}^A));$$

(b_{ii}) *For any regular embedding $X \xrightarrow{g} Y$ (with $\dim(X), \dim(Y) \leqslant d$), with the B-Chern roots $\mu_1^B, \dots, \mu_k^B$ of the normal bundle $\mathcal{N}_g$,*

$$G_Y(g_*\alpha(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = g_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{G_X(\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^A \alpha(\overline{z}^A))(x_i^B = t +_B \mu_i^B|_{i\in\overline{k}}, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t^B}{\prod_{i=1}^k (t +_B \mu_i^B) \cdot t}$$

Conditions $\mathbf{G}(X)$ and (b_i) mean exactly that G defines an operation on $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$.

The condition $\mathbf{H}(d)$ for an r-nary external poly-operation is an obvious extention of the above definition (with separate conditions (b_i), (b_{ii}) for each variable). In particular, it gives a morphism of functors on $((\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d})^r \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$.

5.3 Reduction to the case of mono-operations

We will prove by (the simultaneous for all r) induction on d, that all (external) poly-transformations on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$ extend uniquely to $((\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d})^r \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$, and satisfy (b_i) and (b_{ii}) (in each variable).

Since $A_i^*; i \in \overline{r}$ satisfy $(CONST)$, we have the base of induction $d = 0$.

Suppose we know the induction step $(d-1) \Rightarrow (d)$ for mono-operations. Let us show that it implies the case of (external) poly-operations. Indeed, if for all $j \neq i$, $X_j \in Ob((\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d})$, $P_j \in Ob(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj})$ and $x_j \in A_j^*(X_j \times P_j)$ are fixed, then we get a transformation $A_i^*(Y \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}) \xrightarrow{H} B^*(Y \times \prod_{j\neq i}(X_j \times P_j) \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj})$, or in other words, an operation on $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ from A_i^* to $\widetilde{B}^*$, where $\widetilde{B}^*(Y) := B^*(Y \times \prod_{j\neq i}(X_j \times P_j))$. Notice, that although the theory $\widetilde{B}^*$ is (almost always) not "constant" (not to say "of rational type"), it still satisfies the Definition 2.1. Then it follows from the mono-operational case of the statement that an extension from $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant (d-1)}$ to $(\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d}$ is unique. Applying this inductively to all $i = 1, \dots, r$ we get the uniqueness.

Originally, we have the transformation H defined on $(\mathbf{Sm_k})^{\times r}_{\leqslant (d-1)} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$. We extend it from $(\mathbf{Sm_k})^s_{\leqslant d} \times (\mathbf{Sm_k})^{r-s}_{\leqslant (d-1)} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$ to $(\mathbf{Sm_k})^{s+1}_{\leqslant d} \times (\mathbf{Sm_k})^{r-s-1}_{\leqslant (d-1)} \times \mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$ by induction on s again using the mono-operational case of the statement. Such an extension is obtained separately for each $(r-1)$-tuple $\{x_j|_{j\neq s+1}\}$, $x_j \in A_j^*(X_j \times P_j)$, where $X_j \in Ob((\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant d})$, for $j \leqslant s$, $X_j \in Ob((\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant (d-1)})$, for $j > s+1$, and $P_j \in Ob(\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj})$. So we have (b_i) and (b_{ii}) in the $(s+1)$-st coordinate by construction. As

for the remaining coordinates, if $f = \times_{j\neq s+1} f_j : \times_{j\neq s+1} X_j \to \times_{j\neq s+1} Y_j$ is some map (in the respective category), and $f^*(\{y_j|_{j\neq s+1}\}) = \{x_j|_{j\neq s+1}\}$, then $f^*(H_{\{y_j|_{j\neq s+1}\}})$ is also an extension for $\{x_j|_{j\neq s+1}\}$, since pull-backs and push-forwards along different factors of the external product commute (and by inductive assumption). By the uniqueness, it must coincide with the $H_{\{x_j|_{j\neq s+1}\}}$. This gives (b_i) for all variables. Analogously, if, for some $j \neq i$, we have a regular embedding $X_j \stackrel{g_j}{\to} Y_j$ (in the respective category), $g = g_j \times (\times_{l\neq j,s+1} id_{X_l})$, and $g_*(\{u_l|_{l\neq s+1}\}) = \{v_l|_{l\neq s+1}\}$, then

$$g_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{H_{\{u_j\cdot\prod_{i=1}^k x_i^A(j), u_l|_{l\neq j,s+1}\}}(x_i^B(j) = t +_B \mu_i^B|_{i\in\overline{k}}) \cdot \omega_t^B}{\prod_{i=1}^k (t +_B \mu_i^B)\cdot t}$$

is also an extension for $\{v_l|_{l\neq s+1}\}$, again, since push-forwards and pull-backs along different factors of the external product commute (and by inductive assumption). Then it must coincide with $H_{\{v_l|_{l\neq s+1}\}}$. This gives (b_{ii}) for all variables. And we get the existence.

5.4 Induction step

By 5.3, it is sufficient to treat the case of a mono-transformation $A^* \stackrel{G}{\to} B^*$ on $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$.

Proposition 5.6 *Suppose,* $\mathbf{H}(d-1)$ *is defined, for all poly-transformations,* X *has dimension* $\leqslant (d-1)$*, and* $\mathcal{L}$ *is a line bundle on* X *with* A *and* B*-Chern classes* λ^A *and* λ^B*. Then*

$$G_X(\alpha(\lambda^A, \overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(\alpha(x^A, \overline{z}^A))(x^B = \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B).$$

Proof: Consider first the case of a very ample bundle $\mathcal{L}$.

Lemma 5.7 (cf. [13, Lemma 5.5]) *In the above situation, for a very ample* $\mathcal{L}$*,*

$$G_X(\lambda^A \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(x^A \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(x^B = \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B).$$

Proof: For a very ample $\mathcal{L}$, $\lambda^A = j_*(1)$, for a smooth divisor $Y \stackrel{j}{\to} X$. Then using $(b_{ii}), (b_i)$, and (3), we get:

$$G_X(\beta(\overline{z}^A)\cdot\lambda^A)(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(j_*j^*\beta(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = j_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{G_X(x^A \cdot j^*\beta(\overline{z}^A))(x^B = t +_B \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t^B}{(t +_B \lambda^B)\cdot t} =$$

$$j_*j^* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{G_X(x^A \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(x^B = t +_B \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t^B}{(t +_B \lambda^B)\cdot t} = \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{(t +_B \lambda^B)\cdot G_X(x^A \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(x^B = t +_B \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t^B}{(t +_B \lambda^B)\cdot t} =$$

$$G_X(x^A \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(\lambda^B, \overline{z}^B).$$

□

Then, by Lemma 5.7 and (a_{iv}), for a very ample $\mathcal{L}$, one obtains:

$$G_X((\lambda^A)^r \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(\prod_{i\in\overline{r}} x_i^A \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(x_i^B = \lambda^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}, \overline{z}^B) = G_X((y^A)^r \cdot \beta(\overline{z}^A))(y^B = \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B).$$

In the same way, we get the (external) poly-operational case:

$$H_{X,X_j|_{j\neq i}}\left((\lambda^{A_i})^r \cdot \beta_i(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)), \alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(\overline{z}^B(i), \overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right) =$$
$$H_{X,X_j|_{j\neq i}}\left((x^{A_i}(i))^r \cdot \beta_i(\overline{z}^{A_i}(i)), \alpha_j(\overline{z}^{A_j}(j))|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(x^B(i) = \lambda^B, \overline{z}^B(i), \overline{z}^B(j)|_{j\neq i}\right).$$

Applying it to each term of the Taylor expansion 3.2, we get:

$$G_X(\alpha(\lambda^A,\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(\alpha(x^A,\overline{z}^A))(x^B=\lambda^B,\overline{z}^B),$$

for any very ample $\mathcal{L}$.

An arbitrary line bundle can be presented as $\mathcal{L}\otimes\mathcal{M}^{-1}$, for some very ample line bundles $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{M}$. Then, using the difference variant of (a_{iii}) and the very ample case, we get:

$$G_X(\alpha(\lambda^A -_A \mu^A,\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(\alpha(x^A -_A y^A,\overline{z}^A))(x^B=\lambda^B, y^B=\mu^B,\overline{z}^A) =$$
$$G_X(\alpha(w^A,\overline{z}^A))(w^B=\lambda^B -_B \mu^B,\overline{z}^B),$$

which is equivalent to what we need. □

Suppose, $\mathbf{H}(d-1)$ is defined for all poly-transformations, and $X \overset{p_X}{\to} \mathrm{Spec}(k)$ is a smooth quasi-projective variety of dimension $\leqslant d$. Let $D \overset{d}{\to} X$ be a divisor with strict normal crossing with components $D_{J_0} \overset{\hat{d}_{J_0}}{\to} D$ of multiplicity m_{J_0}, $J_0\in M_0$, $d_{J_0} = d\circ\hat{d}_{J_0}$, and $\lambda^B_{J_0} = c_1^B(\mathcal{O}(D_{J_0}))$. Let $\gamma(\overline{z}^A) = \sum_{J_0\in M_0}(\hat{d}_{J_0})_*(\gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A)) \in A^*(D)[[\overline{z}^A]]$. We would like to define $G_X(d_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B)$. We do it using the Taylor expansion 3.2 and (b_{ii}). Define

$$\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger D)(\overline{z}^B) := \sum_{J_1\in M_1}(d_{J_1})_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{(\partial^{|J_1|-1}G)_{D_{J_1}}(y^A_{J_0}\gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A)|_{J_0\in J_1})(y^B_{J_0}=t+_B\lambda^B_{J_0}|_{J_0\in J_1},\overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega^B_t}{\prod_{J_0\in J_1}(t+_B\lambda^B_{J_0})\cdot t}. \quad (6)$$

Notice, that this expression makes sense since the dimensions of all D_{J_1}'s are $\leqslant(d-1)$. In particular, if $\dim(X)\leqslant(d-1)$, then using the transversal cartesian square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{J_0\in J_1} D_{J_0} & \longrightarrow & \prod_{J_0\in J_1} X \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \Delta_X} \\ D_{J_1} & \longrightarrow & X \end{array},$$

the condition (b_{ii}) for $(\eth^{|J_1|-1}G)$, and the Taylor expansion we obtain that

$$\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger D)(\overline{z}^B) = \sum_{J_1\in M_1}(\partial^{|J_1|-1}G)\left((d_{J_0})_*\gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A)|_{J_0\in J_1}\right)(\overline{z}^B) = G_X(d_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B), \quad (7)$$

so the "new" definition of G_X coincides with the "old" one.

Analogously, suppose that H is an r-nary (external) poly-transformation defined on $((\mathbf{Sm_k})_{\leqslant(d-1)})^r\times\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}^r$ and satisfying (b_i) and (b_{ii}), $X(i)$, $i\in\overline{r}$ are smooth quasi-projective varieties of dimension $\leqslant d$, $D(i)\overset{d(i)}{\longrightarrow}X(i)$ are divisors with strict normal crossing, $D(i)=\sum_{J(i)_0\in M(i)_0}m(i)_{J(i)_0}\cdot D(i)_{J(i)_0}$, with $\hat{d}(i)_{J(i)_0}$, $d(i)_{J(i)_0}$ and $\lambda(i)^B_{J(i)_0}$ defined as above. Denote $\widetilde{\lambda}(i)^B_{J(i)_0} := t+_B\lambda(i)^B_{J(i)_0}$, $(\widetilde{\lambda}(i)^B)^{J(i)_1} = \prod_{J(i)_0\in J(i)_1}\widetilde{\lambda}(i)^B_{J(i)_0}$. Let $\gamma(i)\left(\overline{z}(i)^A\right) = \sum_{J(i)_0\in M(i)_0}(\hat{d}(i)_{J(i)_0})_*(\gamma(i)_{J(i)_0}(\overline{z}(i)^A)) \in A^*(D(i))[[\overline{z}(i)^A]]$. Define

$$\widetilde{H}\left(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)\dagger D(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\right)(\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}) := \sum_{J(i)_1\in M(i)_1;i\in\overline{r}}(\times_{i=1}^r d(i)_{J(i)_1})_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}$$
$$\frac{(\partial^{|J(i)_1|-1;i\in\overline{r}}H)\left(y^A_{J(i)_0}\cdot\gamma_{J(i)_0}(\overline{z}(i)^A)|_{J(i)_0\in J(i)_1;\,i\in\overline{r}}\right)\left(y^B_{J(i)_0}=\widetilde{\lambda}(i)^B_{J(i)_0}|_{J(i)_0\in J(i)_1},\overline{z}(i)^B;|_{i\in\overline{r}}\right)\cdot\omega^B_t}{\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}(\widetilde{\lambda}(i)^B)^{J(i)_1}\cdot t},$$

where the "partial derivatives" are defined in an obvious way. As above, one can see that, for varieties $X(i)$ of dimension $\leqslant (d-1)$,

$$\widetilde{H}\left(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A) \dagger D(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\right) = H\left(d(i)_*\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\right).$$

Denote $\widetilde{A^*(D)} := \oplus_{J_0\in M_0} A^*(D_{J_0})$. Our transformations $\widetilde{G}$ and $\widetilde{H}$ are defined so far on $\widetilde{A^*(D)}$. But we have:

Proposition 5.8

$$\widetilde{\left(\eth^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}H\right)} = \left(\eth^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}\widetilde{H}\right) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \widetilde{\left(\partial^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}H\right)} = \left(\partial^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}\widetilde{H}\right)$$

(the latter as maps $\times_{i\in\overline{r}}(\widetilde{A^*(D(i))}[[\overline{z}(i)^A]])^{\times(k(i)+1)} \longrightarrow B^*(\prod_{i\in\overline{r}} X(i))[[\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}]]$*).*

Proof: The second statement follows from the first one, for which it is sufficient to consider the case of a simple partial derivative $\eth_{(i)}$, where everything is reduced to mono-transformations. Here it follows immediately from the definition (6) that

$$\widetilde{(\eth G)}\left(\alpha((\overline{z}')^A) \dagger D', \beta((\overline{z}'')^A) \dagger D''\right)((\overline{z}^{',''})^B) = (\eth\widetilde{G})\left(\alpha((\overline{z}')^A) \dagger D', \beta((\overline{z}'')^A) \dagger D''\right)((\overline{z}^{',''})^B).$$

□

From Proposition 5.8 and Taylor expansion it easily follows that, for arbitrary X (of dimension $\leqslant d$), $\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger D)(\overline{z}^B)$ depends not on a particular presentation $\gamma = \sum_{J_0\in M_0}(\hat{d}_{J_0})_*(\gamma_{J_0})$, but on γ only.

Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{e} & Y \\ {\scriptstyle\overline{f}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ D & \xrightarrow[d]{} & X. \end{array} \tag{8}$$

be a Cartesian square, where X and Y are smooth and $D \xrightarrow{d} X$ and $E \xrightarrow{e} Y$ are divisors with strict normal crossing.

Proposition 5.9 *For any cartesian diagram* (8) *with* X *and* Y *of dimension* $\leqslant d$*, one has:*

$$f^*\widetilde{G}\Big(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger D\Big)(\overline{z}^B) = \widetilde{G}\Big(\overline{f}^\star(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \dagger E\Big)(\overline{z}^B).$$

More generally, for an r*-nary (external) poly-transformation, for* $\dim(X(i)), \dim(Y(i)) \leqslant d$*, we have:*

$$\left(\times_{i\in\overline{r}} f(i)\right)^*\widetilde{H}\Big(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A) \dagger D(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\Big)(\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}) = \widetilde{H}\Big(\overline{f}(i)^\star\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A) \dagger E(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\Big)(\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}).$$

Proof: Let us treat the case of a smooth D first. Suppose, D is smooth, $E = \sum_{J_0\in M_0} m_{J_0}\cdot E_{J_0}$, $\lambda^B = c_1^B(\mathcal{O}_X(D))$, $\widetilde{\lambda}^B = t +_B \lambda^B$ and $\mu^B_{J_0} = c_1^B(\mathcal{O}_Y(E_{J_0}))$, $\widetilde{\mu}^B_{J_0} = t +_B \mu^B_{J_0}$ (and similar for A). Denote $(\widetilde{\mu}^B)^{J_1} = \prod_{J_0\in J_1}\widetilde{\mu}^B_{J_0}$, $\widetilde{\mu}^B_{J_1} = \sum_{J_0\in J_1} m_{J_0}\cdot_B \widetilde{\mu}^B_{J_0}$, and $C^B_{J_1} = \left(F^{m_{J_0};J_0\in M_0}_{J_1}\right)^B = \frac{\sum_{I_1\subset J_1}(-1)^{|J_1|-|I_1|}\widetilde{\mu}^B_{I_1}}{(\widetilde{\mu}^B)^{J_1}}$ (and similar for A).

Proposition 5.10 *In the above situation, if* $\dim(Y) \leqslant d$, *then*

$$\widetilde{G}\Big(\overline{f}^{\star}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \dagger E\Big)(\overline{z}^B) = \sum_{J_1 \in M_1} (e_{J_1})_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{C^B_{J_1} \cdot G_{E_{J_1}}\Big(y^A \cdot f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A))\Big)(y^B = f^*_{J_1}\widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{f^*_{J_1}\widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t}.$$

More generally, if $D(i) \xrightarrow{d(i)} X(i)$ *are smooth divisors and* $\dim(Y(i)) \leqslant d$, *then*

$$\widetilde{H}\Big(\overline{f}(i)^{\star}\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A) \dagger E(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\Big)(\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}) = \sum_{J(i)_1 \in M(i)_1; i\in\overline{r}} (\times_{i\in\overline{r}} e(i)_{J(i)_1})_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}$$

$$\frac{\prod_{i\in\overline{r}} C(i)^B_{J(i)_1} \cdot H\left(y(i)^A \cdot f(i)^*_{J(i)_1}\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\right)\left(y(i)^B = f(i)^*_{J(i)_1}\widetilde{\lambda(i)}^B, \overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}\right) \cdot \omega_t}{\prod_{i\in\overline{r}} f(i)^*_{J(i)_1}\widetilde{\lambda(i)}^B \cdot t}.$$

Proof: Using the cartesian square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{J_1\in J_2} E_{J_1} & \longrightarrow & \prod_{J_1\in J_2} Y \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \Delta_Y} \\ E_{Supp(J_2)} & \longrightarrow & Y \end{array},$$

and the Excess Intersection Formula (Proposition 2.7), we obtain:

$$\widetilde{G}(\overline{f}^{\star}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \dagger E)(\overline{z}^B) = \widetilde{G}\left(\sum_{J_1\in M_1} (\hat{e}_{J_1})_* f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \cdot C^A_{J_1}\right)(\overline{z}^B) = \sum_{J_2\in M_2} (e_{Supp(J_2)})_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}$$

$$\frac{(\partial^{|J_2|-1}G)_{E_{Supp(J_2)}}\left(\prod_{J_0\in J'_1} y^A_{J_0} \cdot f^*_{Supp(J_2)}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \cdot C^A_{J'_1}|_{J'_1\in J_2}\right)(y^B_{J_0} = \widetilde{\mu}^B_{J_0}|_{J_0\in M_0}, \overline{z}^B)\omega_t}{(\widetilde{\mu}^B)^{Supp(J_2)} \cdot t}$$

Thus, it is equal to

$$\sum_{J_1\in M_1} (e_{J_1})_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \sum_{\substack{J_2\in M_2 \\ Supp(J_2)=J_1}} R_{J_2} \cdot \omega_t,$$

where

$$R_{J_2} = \frac{(\partial^{|J_2|-1}G)_{E_{J_1}}\left(\prod_{J_0\in J'_1} y^A_{J_0} \cdot f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \cdot C^A_{J'_1}|_{J'_1\in J_2}\right)(y^B_{J_0} = \widetilde{\mu}^B_{J_0}|_{J_0\in M_0}, \overline{z}^B)}{(\widetilde{\mu}^B)^{J_1} \cdot t}$$

$$= \frac{(\partial^{|J_2|-1}G)_{E_{J_1}}\left(f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \cdot \left(\sum_{I'_1\subset J'_1} (-1)^{|J'_1|-|I'_1|}\widetilde{\mu}^A_{I'_1}\right)|_{J'_1\in J_2}\right)(\overline{z}^B)}{(\widetilde{\mu}^B)^{J_1} \cdot t}.$$

Consider the pair of composable maps (of sets) between abelian groups:

$$\mathbb{Z}[J_1] \xrightarrow{F} A^*(E_{J_1})[[t, \overline{z}^A]] \xrightarrow{G} B^*(E_{J_1})[[t, \overline{z}^B]],$$

where $\mathbb{Z}[J_1] = \oplus_{J_0\in J_1}\mathbb{Z} \cdot x_{J_0}$, and $\sum_{J_0\in J_1} u_{J_0} \cdot x_{J_0} \overset{F}{\mapsto} \left(\sum_{J_0\in J_1}(u_{J_0} \cdot m_{J_0}) \cdot_A \widetilde{\mu}_{J_0}\right) \cdot f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A))$. Then, by the Chain Rule (Proposition 3.3),

$$\sum_{\substack{J_2\in M_2 \\ Supp(J_2)=J_1}} (\partial^{|J_2|-1}G)_{E_{J_1}}\left(f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) \cdot \left(\sum_{I'_1\subset J'_1} (-1)^{|J'_1|-|I'_1|}\widetilde{\mu}^A_{I'_1}\right)|_{J'_1\in J_2}\right)(\overline{z}^B) =$$

$$\sum_{I_1\subset J_1} (-1)^{|J_1|-|I_1|} G_{E_{J_1}}(y^A \cdot f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)))(y^B = \widetilde{\mu}^B_{I_1}, \overline{z}^B).$$

Thus,

$$\widetilde{G}\left(\overline{f}^{\star}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A))\dagger E\right)(\overline{z}^B)=\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\sum_{J_1\in M_1}(e_{J_1})_*\frac{\sum_{I_1\subset J_1}(-1)^{|J_1|-|I_1|}G_{E_{J_1}}(y^A\cdot f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)))(y^B=\widetilde{\mu}^B_{I_1},\overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t}{(\widetilde{\mu}^B)^{J_1}\cdot t}.$$

The rest of the proof is identical to that of [13, Lemma 5.8] (as no additive properties of G are used from this point). And we obtain:

$$\widetilde{G}\left(\overline{f}^{\star}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A))\dagger E\right)(\overline{z}^B)=\sum_{J_1\in M_1}(e_{J_1})_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{C^B_{J_1}\cdot G_{E_{J_1}}(y^A\cdot f^*_{J_1}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)))(y^B=f^*_{J_1}\widetilde{\lambda}^B,\overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t}{f^*_{J_1}\widetilde{\lambda}^B\cdot t}.$$

In exactly the same way, if $D(i)$ is a smooth divisor on $X(i)$, for an r-nary (external) poly-transformation, we get:

$$\widetilde{H}\Big(\overline{f}(i)^{\star}\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)\dagger E(i),\gamma(j)(\overline{z}(j)^A)\dagger E(j)|_{j\neq i}\Big)(\overline{z}(j)^B|_{j\in\overline{r}})=\sum_{J(i)_1\in M(i)_1}(e(i)_{J(i)_1})_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}$$

$$\frac{C(i)^B_{J(i)_1}\cdot\widetilde{H}\left(y^A\cdot f(i)^*_{J(i)_1}(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)),\gamma(j)(\overline{z}(j)^A)\dagger E(j)|_{j\neq i}\right)\left(y^B=f(i)^*_{J(i)_1}\widetilde{\overline{\lambda(i)}}^B,\overline{z}(j)^B|_{j\in\overline{r}}\right)\cdot\omega_t}{f(i)^*_{J(i)_1}\widetilde{\overline{\lambda(i)}}^B\cdot t}.$$

□

It follows from Proposition 5.10 and the Multiple Points Excess Intersection Formula (Proposition 2.6) that for an r-nary (external) poly-transformation H, smooth divisors $D(i)\xrightarrow{d(i)}X(i)$, maps $Y(i)\xrightarrow{f(i)}X(i)$ fitting cartesian squares as above, and $\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)\in A^*(D(i))[[\overline{z}(i)^A]]$, one has:

$$(\times_{i\in\overline{r}}f(i))^*\widetilde{H}\Big(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)\dagger D(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\Big)(\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}})=\widetilde{H}\Big(\overline{f}(i)^{\star}\gamma(i)(\overline{z}(i)^A)\dagger E(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}\Big)(\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}).$$

Suppose now, $D=\sum_{I_0\in L_0}D_{I_0}$ is arbitrary, and $\gamma(\overline{z}^A)=\sum_{I_0\in L_0}\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)$. Then from the above we know the case of a smooth divisor D_{I_0}, and $\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)$ on it. But $\overline{f}^{\star}$ is additive. Hence,

$$\widetilde{G}\Big(\overline{f}^{\star}\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger E\Big)(\overline{z}^B)=\sum_{I_1\in L_1}\big(\partial^{|I_1|-1}\widetilde{G}\big)\Big(\overline{f}^{\star}(\hat{d}_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)\dagger E|_{I_0\in I_1}\Big)(\overline{z}^B)=$$

$$\sum_{I_1\in L_1}\big(\widetilde{\partial^{|I_1|-1}G}\big)\Big(\overline{f}^{\star}(\hat{d}_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)\dagger E|_{I_0\in I_1}\Big)(\overline{z}^B)=\sum_{I_1\in L_1}f^*\big(\widetilde{\partial^{|I_1|-1}G}\big)\Big((\hat{d}_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)\dagger D|_{I_0\in I_1}\Big)(\overline{z}^B)=$$

$$\sum_{I_1\in L_1}f^*\big(\partial^{|I_1|-1}\widetilde{G}\big)\Big((\hat{d}_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)\dagger D|_{I_0\in I_1}\Big)(\overline{z}^B)=f^*\widetilde{G}\big(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger D\big)(\overline{z}^B).$$

The case of a poly-transformation follows from the same considerations. □

Let X be a smooth quasi-projective variety of dimension $\leqslant d$. We would like to define $\mathbf{G}(X)$. Let us start with the $\overline{A}^*$-part. By Theorem 2.2, we know that $\overline{A}^*=\operatorname{Coker}(c_{1,0}\oplus c_{0,1}\xrightarrow{d_{1,0}\oplus d_{0,1}}c_{0,0})$.

Proposition 5.11 *Suppose $(V(i)\overset{v(i)}{\to}\widetilde{X}(i)\overset{\rho(i)}{\to}X(i),\gamma(i)(\overline{z}^A));i\in\overline{r}$ be some elements as in $c_{0,0}$, and H be some r-nary (external) poly-transformation. Then*

$$\widetilde{H}(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}})\in im(\times_{i\in\overline{r}}\rho(i)^*).$$

Proof: From evident transversal cartesian squares, it is sufficient to prove that $\widetilde{H}(\gamma(i)(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V(i)|_{i\in\overline{r}}) \in im(\rho(i)^*)$, for each i. Hence, it is sufficient to consider the case of a mono-transformation. Here we follow the proof of [13, Proposition 5.9].

Start with the case where $\widetilde{X} \stackrel{\rho}{\to} X$ is the permitted blow up with smooth centers R_j, and the respective components E_j of a special divisor of ρ with maps: $R_j \stackrel{\varepsilon_j}{\leftarrow} E_j \stackrel{e_j}{\to} \widetilde{X}$. Since ρ is an isomorphism outside V, the components E_j of the special divisor of ρ are components of V (and so, numbered by the subset of M_0). In particular, these are transversal to all distinct components of V. Let $\gamma(\overline{z}^A) = \sum_{I_0\in M_0}(\hat{v}_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)$, where $\gamma_{I_0} \in A^*(V_{I_0})[[\overline{z}^A]]$. By Proposition 2.8, to prove that $\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V) \in im(\rho^*)$ one needs to show that $e^*_{J_0}(\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V)) \in im(\varepsilon^*_{J_0})$. If $V_{I_0} \neq E_{J_0}$, then we have a transversal cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{I_0,J_0} & \xrightarrow{u_{I_0,J_0}} & E_{J_0} \\ {\scriptstyle h_{I_0,J_0}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle e_{J_0}} \\ V_{I_0} & \xrightarrow[v_{I_0}]{} & \widetilde{X}. \end{array}$$

By Proposition 5.9, and since $\dim(H_{I_0,J_0}), \dim(V_{I_0}), \dim(E_{J_0}) \leqslant (d-1)$, we get:

$$e^*_{J_0}\widetilde{G}(\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V_{I_0}) = \widetilde{G}(h^*_{I_0,J_0}\gamma_i(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H_{I_0,J_0}) = G((u_{I_0,J_0})_*h^*_{I_0,J_0}\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)) = G(e^*_{J_0}(v_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)).$$

And, for the E_{J_0}-component, by the very definition,

$$e^*_{J_0}\widetilde{G}(\gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A) \dagger E_{J_0})(\overline{z}^B) = \lambda^B_{J_0} \cdot \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{G(y^A \cdot \gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A))(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B_{J_0}, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{\widetilde{\lambda}^B_{J_0} \cdot t} =$$
$$G(\lambda^A_{J_0} \cdot \gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B) = G(e^*_{J_0}(e_{J_0})_*\gamma_{J_0}(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B).$$

Thus, $e^*_{J_0}\widetilde{G}(\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V_{I_0}) = G(e^*_{J_0}(v_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A))$, for all components V_{I_0} of V. And similar equality holds for any r-nary (external) poly-transformation H. Then, from the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V & \xrightarrow{v} & \widetilde{X} & \xleftarrow{e_{J_0}} & E_{J_0} \\ {\scriptstyle \rho_V}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle \rho}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varepsilon_{J_0}} \\ Z & \xrightarrow[z]{} & X & \xleftarrow[r_{J_0}]{} & R_{J_0} \end{array}$$

with the left square cartesian, using the fact that $\dim(E_{J_0}), \dim(R_{J_0}) \leqslant (d-1)$, we obtain:

$$e^*_{J_0}\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V) = e^*_{J_0} \sum_{I_1\in M_1} \Delta^*(\widetilde{\partial^{|I_1|-1}G})\Big(\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V_{I_0}|_{I_0\in I_1}\Big) =$$
$$\sum_{I_1\in M_1} (\partial^{|I_1|-1}G)\Big(e^*_{J_0}(v_{I_0})_*\gamma_{I_0}(\overline{z}^A)|_{I_0\in I_1}\Big) = G(e^*_{J_0}v_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) =$$
$$G(e^*_{J_0}v_*\rho^!\beta(\overline{z}^A)) = G(e^*_{J_0}\rho^*z_*\beta(\overline{z}^A)) = G(\varepsilon^*_{J_0}r^*_{J_0}z_*\beta(\overline{z}^A)) = \varepsilon^*_{J_0}G(r^*_{J_0}z_*\beta(\overline{z}^A)).$$

This proves the case of a permitted blow up ρ.

If ρ is an arbitrary projective bi-rational map, then (by the results of Hironaka [2]) there exists a permitted blow up $\rho' = \rho \circ \pi$ with centers over Z, such that $V' = \pi^*(V)$ is also a divisor with strict normal crossing. By Proposition 5.9, $\pi^*\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V) = \widetilde{G}(\pi^\star_V\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V')$, and the latter is in the $im(\pi^*\rho^*)$ by the already proven case. Because π^* is injective, we get: $\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger V) \in im(\rho^*)$. $\square$

Let $\alpha(\overline{z}^A)=\sum_{j\in K}\left(V\{j\}\stackrel{v\{j\}}{\to}\widetilde{X}\{j\}\stackrel{\rho\{j\}}{\to}X,\gamma\{j\}(\overline{z}^A)\right)\in c_{0,0}$.

Let us define:

$$\overline{G}_X(\alpha(\overline{z}^A))(\overline{z}^B):=\sum_{J\subset K}\frac{\Delta_X^*\big(\times_{j\in J}\rho\{j\}\big)_*(\eth^{|J|-1}\widetilde{G})_{(\times_{j\in J}\widetilde{X}\{j\})}\Big(\gamma\{j\}(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V\{j\}|_{j\in J}\Big)(\overline{z}^B)}{\prod_{j\in J}(\rho\{j\})_*(1)}. \tag{9}$$

In exactly the same way one can define an r-nary (external) poly-transformation $\overline{H}$ on $\times_{i\in\overline{r}}(c_{0,0}(X(i)))$.

Proposition 5.12

$$\overline{\big(\eth^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}H\big)}=\Big(\eth^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}H\Big)\qquad and\qquad \overline{\big(\partial^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}H\big)}=\Big(\partial^{k(i);i\in\overline{r}}H\Big)$$

(the latter as maps $\times_{i\in\overline{r}}(c_{0,0}(X(i)))^{\times(k(i)+1)}\longrightarrow B^*(\times_{i\in\overline{r}}X(i))[[\overline{z}(i)^B|_{i\in\overline{r}}]]$*).*

Proof: The second statement follows from the first one for which it is clearly sufficient to consider the case of a single partial derivative, and so, of a mono-operation. Then, it follows easily from Proposition 5.8 that

$$\overline{(\eth G)}\big(\alpha((\overline{z}')^A),\beta((\overline{z}'')^A)\big)((\overline{z}^{',''})^B)=\eth\overline{G}\big(\alpha((\overline{z}')^A),\beta((\overline{z}'')^A)\big)((\overline{z}^{',''})^B).$$

□

To show that $\overline{H}$ is well-defined on $\overline{A}^*(X)[[\overline{z}^A]]$, by Taylor expansion, one needs to show that all it's simple partial derivatives vanish on $im(d^{\mathfrak{c}}_{1,0}\oplus d^{\mathfrak{c}}_{0,1})$ (in the respective coordinate, and anything in the remaining ones). Thus, by Proposition 5.12, it is sufficient to prove that any mono-transformation $\overline{G}$ vanishes on such an image. Using Taylor expansion and Proposition 5.12 again, we see that it is sufficient to check this for each additive generator of the image. Here we mostly follow the proof of [13, Theorem 5.1].

The 1-st part of $(d^{\mathfrak{c}}_{1,0})$: Suppose,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V' & \xrightarrow{v'} & \widetilde{\widetilde{X}} \\ {\scriptstyle\pi_V}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\pi} \\ V & \xrightarrow[v]{} & \widetilde{X} \end{array}$$

be the cartesian square, with V and V' divisors with strict normal crossing, with π the blow up over V permitted w.r.to V, and $V=\rho^{-1}(Z)$ for some closed subscheme $Z\stackrel{z}{\to}X$. By the Taylor expansion and Proposition 5.12, it is sufficient to check that the pairs:
$((Z\stackrel{z}{\to}X\stackrel{\rho}{\leftarrow}\widetilde{X}),\gamma(\overline{z}^A))$ and $((Z\stackrel{z}{\to}X\stackrel{\rho\circ\pi}{\leftarrow}\widetilde{\widetilde{X}}),\pi_V^\star(\gamma)(\overline{z}^A))$ produce the same result. This follows from Propositions 5.9 and 5.11:

$$\frac{\rho_*\pi_*\widetilde{G}(\pi_V^\star\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V')(\overline{z}^B)}{\rho_*\pi_*(1)}=\frac{\rho_*\pi_*\pi^*\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V)(\overline{z}^B)}{\rho_*\pi_*\pi^*(1)}=\frac{\rho_*\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V)(\overline{z}^B)}{\rho_*(1)}.$$

The 2-nd part of $(d^{\mathfrak{c}}_{1,0})$: It follows from the definition of $\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V)$ that if γ is supported on some subdivisor $V_2\stackrel{f}{\to}V_1$, then $\widetilde{G}(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V_2)=\widetilde{G}(f_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\dagger V_1)$. By the Taylor expansion and Proposition 5.12, this is all what we need.

The $(d^{\xi}_{0,1})$: Suppose, $\widetilde{X\times\mathbb{P}^1}\xrightarrow{\rho} X\times\mathbb{P}^1$ be projective birational map, isomorphic outside the strict normal crossing divisor W, where $W=\rho^{-1}(Z)$ for some closed subscheme $Z\xrightarrow{z} X\times\mathbb{P}^1$, W has no components over 0 and 1, such that the preimages $X_0=\rho^{-1}(X\times\{0\})$, and $X_1=\rho^{-1}(X\times\{1\})$ are smooth divisors on $\widetilde{X\times\mathbb{P}^1}$, and $W\cap X_0\hookrightarrow X_0$ and $W\cap X_1\hookrightarrow X_1$ are divisors with strict normal crossing. In particular, for each component S of W, $S_0=s^{-1}(X\times\{0\})\xrightarrow{i_0} S$ and $S_1=s^{-1}(X\times\{1\})\xrightarrow{i_1} S$ are divisors with strict normal crossing.

Let $\delta(\overline{z}^A)=\sum_S\delta_S\in A^*(W)[[\overline{z}^A]]\cap im(\rho^!)$. We need to show that $\overline{G}$ takes the same values on the pairs

$$((Z_0\to X\xleftarrow{\rho_0}X_0),\sum\nolimits_S i_0^\star\delta_S(\overline{z}^A))\quad\text{ and }\quad((Z_1\to X\xleftarrow{\rho_1}X_1),\sum\nolimits_S i_1^\star\delta_S(\overline{z}^A)).$$

Using the definition of $\overline{G}$ - (9), the Taylor expansion and Proposition 5.12, it is sufficient to show that (any mono-transformation) $\overline{G}$ takes the same values on the pairs

$$((Z_0\to X\xleftarrow{\rho_0}X_0),i_0^\star\delta_S(\overline{z}^A))\quad\text{ and }\quad((Z_1\to X\xleftarrow{\rho_1}X_1),i_1^\star\delta_S(\overline{z}^A)),$$

for each component S of W, and for each $\delta_S\in A^*(S)[[\overline{z}^A]]$. Any such element δ_S can be written as $\pi_S^*\alpha+\beta$, for some $\alpha\in A^*(\mathrm{Spec}(k))[[\overline{z}^A]]$ and $\beta\in\overline{A}^*(S)[[\overline{z}^A]]$. Again, due to the Taylor expansion and Proposition 5.12, we can treat α and β separately.

Let us define:

$$\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}(\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S)(\overline{z}^B):=s_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{\pi_S^*G(y^A\cdot\alpha(\overline{z}^A))(y^B=\widetilde{\lambda}^B,\overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t}{\widetilde{\lambda}^B\cdot t},$$

where $\lambda^B=c_1^B(\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{X\times\mathbb{P}^1}}(S))$ and $\widetilde{\lambda}^B=t+_B\lambda^B$. Then we have:

Lemma 5.13

$$\widetilde{i}_0^*\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S\big)=\widetilde{G}\big(i_0^\star\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S_0\big)\quad\textit{and}\quad\widetilde{i}_1^*\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S\big)=\widetilde{G}\big(i_1^\star\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S_1\big)$$

Proof: From symmetry, it is sufficient to treat S_0. Using Proposition 2.6, Proposition 5.10 and the cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_0 & \xrightarrow{s_0} & X_0 \\ {\scriptstyle i_0}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\widetilde{i}_0} \\ S & \xrightarrow[s]{} & \widetilde{X\times\mathbb{P}^1}, \end{array}$$

where $S_0=\sum_{k\in K}m_k\cdot S_{0,k}$, we obtain:

$$\widetilde{i}_0^*\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S\big)(\overline{z}^B)=\widetilde{i}_0^*s_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{\pi_S^*G\big(y^A\cdot\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B=\widetilde{\lambda}^B,\overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t}{\widetilde{\lambda}^B\cdot t}=$$

$$\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\sum_{J\subset K}(s_{0,J})_*\frac{C_J^B\cdot i_{0,J}^*\pi_S^*G\big(y^A\cdot\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B=i_{0,J}^*\widetilde{\lambda}^B,\overline{z}^B)\cdot\omega_t}{i_{0,J}^*\widetilde{\lambda}^B\cdot t}=\widetilde{G}\big(i_0^\star\pi_S^*\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\dagger S_0\big)(\overline{z}^B).$$

□

As for β, due to the continuity of G (Proposition 5.3), we can assume that $\beta\in\overline{A}^*(S)[\overline{z}^A]$ (due to the Taylor expansion and Proposition 5.12 we can even assume that it is a monomial in $\overline{z}^A$). We have the following simple result:

Lemma 5.14 ([13, Lemma 5.13]) *Let S be quasi-projective variety, and $T \subset S$ be a divisor. Then any element of $\overline{A}^*(S)$ can be represented as $f_*(u)$, where $u \in A^*(Y)$ and $Y \stackrel{f}{\to} S$ is a closed subscheme containing no components of T.*

Thus, we can assume that our $\beta(\overline{z}^A) \in \overline{A}^*(S)[[\overline{z}^A]]$ is equal to p_*h_*x, where $\widetilde{S} \stackrel{p}{\to} S$ is a projective bi-rational map, isomorphism outside Y, where Y contains no components of S_0 and S_1, the preimage $H = p^{-1}Y$ is a divisor with strict normal crossing on $\widetilde{S}$, and $x \in A^*(H)[[\overline{z}^A]]$. Let $\gamma(\overline{z}^A) = p^!(p_H)_*(x) \in A^*(H)[[\overline{z}^A]]$. In particular, $h_*(\gamma) = p^*(\beta)$. Define:

$$\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S\big)(\overline{z}^B) := s_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{p_*\widetilde{G}\big(y^A \cdot \gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H\big)(y^B = p^*\widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{p_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t}.$$

We have:

Lemma 5.15

$$\widetilde{i}_0^*\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S\big) = \widetilde{G}\big(i_0^\star\beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S_0\big) \quad \textit{and} \quad \widetilde{i}_1^*\widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S\big) = \widetilde{G}\big(i_1^\star\beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S_1\big)$$

Proof: Again, it is sufficient to treat the case of S_0. By our condition, $p \circ h(H)$ itersects each component of S_0 and S_1 in positive codimension.

Consider one of these components $S_{0,k}$. By the results of Hironaka (see [2]), we can find a permitted blow up $\widetilde{S}_{0,k} \stackrel{p_{0,k}}{\to} S_{0,k}$, which fits into the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
H_{0,k} & \xrightarrow{h_{0,k}} & \widetilde{S}_{0,k} & \xrightarrow{p_{0,k}} & S_{0,k} & \xrightarrow{s_{0,k}} & X_0 \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle i_{0,H}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{i}_{0,k}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle i_{0,k}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{i}_0} \\
H & \xrightarrow[h]{} & \widetilde{S} & \xrightarrow[p]{} & S & \xrightarrow[s]{} & \widetilde{X \times \mathbb{P}^1},
\end{array}$$

where the left square is cartesian, and $H_{0,k}$ is a divisor with strict normal crossing on $\widetilde{S}_{0,k}$.

We have the following easy result:

Lemma 5.16 ([13, Lemma 5.11]) *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\widetilde{T} & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{j}} & \widetilde{S} \\
{\scriptstyle q}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} \\
T & \xrightarrow[j]{} & S
\end{array}$$

be commutative diagram with p and q - projective bi-rational. Let $x \in im(p^*)$. Then:

$$\frac{q_*(\widetilde{j}^*(x))}{q_*(1)} = j^*\left(\frac{p_*(x)}{p_*(1)}\right).$$

By Proposition 5.11, $\widetilde{G}\big(y^A \cdot \gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H\big)(y^B = p^*\widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \in im(p^*)$. Using Lemma 5.16, Proposition 5.9, and (b_i), we get:

$$i_{0,k}^* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{p_*\widetilde{G}\big(y^A \cdot \gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{p_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} = \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{(p_{0,k})_*\widetilde{i}_{0,k}^*\widetilde{G}\big(y^A \cdot \gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{(p_{0,k})_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} =$$

$$\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{(p_{0,k})_*G\big(y^A \cdot \widetilde{i}_{0,k}^*h_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{(p_{0,k})_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} = \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{(p_{0,k})_*G\big(y^A \cdot p_{0,k}^*i_{0,k}^*\beta(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{(p_{0,k})_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} =$$

$$\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{G\big(y^A \cdot i_{0,k}^*\beta(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{\widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t}.$$

This clearly implies (using (b_i)) that, for arbitrary $J \subset K$, we have:

$$i_{0,J}^* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{p_* \widetilde{G}\big(y^A \cdot \gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{p_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} = \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{G\big(y^A \cdot i_{0,J}^* \beta(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{\widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t}.$$

Then, from Proposition 2.6 and Proposition 5.10, we obtain:

$$\widetilde{i}_0^* \widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S\big)(\overline{z}^B) = \widetilde{i}_0^* s_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{p_* \widetilde{G}\big(y^A \cdot \gamma(\overline{z}^A) \dagger H\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{p_*(1) \cdot \widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} =$$

$$\sum_{J \subset K} (s_{0,J})_* \operatorname*{Res}_{t=0} \frac{C_J^B \cdot G\big(y^A \cdot i_{0,J}^* \beta(\overline{z}^A)\big)(y^B = \widetilde{\lambda}^B, \overline{z}^B) \cdot \omega_t}{\widetilde{\lambda}^B \cdot t} = \widetilde{G}\big(i_0^\star \beta(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S_0\big)(\overline{z}^B).$$

□

Since ρ has no centers over 0 and 1, the following cartesian diagram is transversal:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X_0 & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{i}_0} & \widetilde{X \times \mathbb{P}^1} & \xleftarrow{\widetilde{i}_1} & X_1 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho_0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho_1} \\ X \times \{0\} & \xrightarrow[i_0]{} & X \times \mathbb{P}^1 & \xleftarrow[i_1]{} & X \times \{1\}. \end{array}$$

From Lemmas 5.13 and 5.15, we obtain that for $\varepsilon = \beta$, or $\pi_S^* \alpha$, we have:

$$\frac{(\rho_0)_* \widetilde{G}\big(i_0^\star \varepsilon(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S_0\big)}{(\rho_0)_*(1)} = i_0^* \left(\frac{\rho_* \widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\varepsilon(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S\big)}{\rho_*(1)} \right) = i_1^* \left(\frac{\rho_* \widetilde{\widetilde{G}}\big(\varepsilon(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S\big)}{\rho_*(1)} \right) = \frac{(\rho_1)_* \widetilde{G}\big(i_1^\star \varepsilon(\overline{z}^A) \dagger S_1\big)}{(\rho_1)_*(1)}.$$

Hence, $\overline{G}$ (as well as any other (external) poly-transformation) takes the same values on the pairs

$$((Z_0 \to X \overset{\rho_0}{\leftarrow} X_0), i_0^\star \varepsilon(\overline{z}^A)) \quad \text{and} \quad ((Z_1 \to X \overset{\rho_1}{\leftarrow} X_1), i_1^\star \varepsilon(\overline{z}^A)).$$

Thus, $\overline{G}$ is trivial on the $im(d_{0,1}^\kappa)$, and so is well-defined on $\overline{A}^*(X)$.

For the constant part, we define:

$$\overline{G}\big(\pi_X^* \alpha(\overline{z}^A)\big)(\overline{z}^B) := \pi_X^* G\big(\alpha(\overline{z}^A)\big)(\overline{z}^B). \tag{10}$$

For an arbitrary $\gamma(\overline{z}^A) = \pi_X^* \alpha(\overline{z}^A) + \beta(\overline{z}^A)$, where $\alpha \in A[[\overline{z}^A]]$, $\beta \in \overline{A}^*(X)[[\overline{z}^A]]$, we define:

$$G(\gamma(\overline{z}^A)) := \overline{G}(\pi_X^* \alpha(\overline{z}^A)) + \overline{G}(\beta(\overline{z}^A)) + \overline{\partial G}(\pi_X^* \alpha(\overline{z}^A), \beta(\overline{z}^A)). \tag{11}$$

We get a well-defined element G_X of $\operatorname{Hom}_{Filt}(A^*(X)[[\overline{z}^A]], B^*(X)[[\overline{z}^B]])$.

Proposition 5.17 *The above G_X satisfies the conditions $(a_i), (a_{ii}), (a_{iii}), (a_{iv})$ of $\mathbf{G}(X)$.*

Proof: It follows immediately from the definition that the transforamtions $\widetilde{G}$, $\overline{G}$ and G_X satisfy the conditions of $\mathbf{G}(X)$. □

Now we can, finally, complete the induction step. We closely follow [13, Proposition 5.16].

Proposition 5.18 *Suppose,* $\mathbf{H}(d-1)$ *is defined for all (external)* r*-nary poly-transformations. Then these extend uniquely to* $\mathbf{H}(d)$*.*

Proof: We already know that, for arbitrary X of dimension $\leqslant d$, we can define $\mathbf{H}_X$ which satisfies the conditions of $\mathbf{H}(X)$. The uniqueness follows from the fact that the formulas (6) and (9) above are forced by the conditions (b_{ii}) and (b_i). It remains to check that the whole collection $\mathbf{H}(X)$, $\dim(X) \leqslant d$ satisfies the conditions (b_i) and (b_{ii}). It is clearly sufficient to consider the case of a mono-operation G. Let $X \stackrel{f}{\to} Y$ be a map, with $\dim(X), \dim(Y) \leqslant d$. Using the definition of G_X, G_Y, the fact that f^* preserves the $A^* = A \oplus \overline{A}^*$ decomposition, and again reducing to the case of a mono-operation we see that it is sufficient to treat the cases of $\gamma = \beta(\overline{z}^A) \in \overline{A}^*(X)[[\overline{z}^A]]$ and of $\gamma = \pi_X^* \alpha(\overline{z}^A)$, for some $\alpha(\overline{z}^A) \in A[[\overline{z}^A]]$. The constant case follows straight from the definition. And for the β-case, using the continuity (Proposition 5.3) and the definition (9) of $\overline{G}$, and passing from poly to mono-operations, we can assume that β is represented by one element $(V_Y \stackrel{v_Y}{\to} \widetilde{Y} \stackrel{\rho_Y}{\to} Y, \gamma(\overline{z}^A))$, where ρ_Y is a projective bi-rational map, isomorphism outside the strict normal crossing divisor V_Y, where $\gamma \in A^*(V_Y)[[\overline{z}^A]] \cap \rho_Y^!$. Then $\beta = \frac{(\rho_Y)_*(v_Y)_*(\gamma)}{(\rho_Y)_*(1)}$. Using the result of Hironaka [2], we can produce a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} V_X & \xrightarrow{v_X} & \widetilde{X} & \xrightarrow{\rho_X} & X \\ {\scriptstyle f_V}\downarrow & & {\scriptstyle \widetilde{f}}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ V_Y & \xrightarrow[v_Y]{} & \widetilde{Y} & \xrightarrow[\rho_Y]{} & Y, \end{array}$$

where ρ_X is projective bi-rational, the left square is cartesian, and $V_X \stackrel{v_X}{\to} \widetilde{X}$ is a divisor with strict normal crossing. Using Proposition 5.11, Lemma 5.16, Proposition 5.9, and Proposition 2.6, we obtain:

$$f^* G_Y\left(\frac{(\rho_Y)_*(v_Y)_*(\gamma)}{(\rho_Y)_*(1)}\right) := f^*\left(\frac{(\rho_Y)_*\widetilde{G}(\gamma \dagger V_Y)}{(\rho_Y)_*(1)}\right) = \frac{(\rho_X)_*\widetilde{f}^*\widetilde{G}(\gamma \dagger V_Y)}{(\rho_X)_*(1)} = \frac{(\rho_X)_*\widetilde{G}(f_V^\star(\gamma) \dagger V_X)}{(\rho_X)_*(1)} =:$$
$$G_X\left(\frac{(\rho_X)_*(v_X)_* f_V^\star(\gamma)}{(\rho_X)_*(1)}\right) = G_X\left(\frac{(\rho_X)_*\widetilde{f}^*(v_Y)_*(\gamma)}{(\rho_X)_*(1)}\right) = G_X\left(f^*\left(\frac{(\rho_Y)_*(v_Y)_*(\gamma)}{(\rho_Y)_*(1)}\right)\right).$$

And (b_i) is proven.

Let $X \stackrel{j}{\to} Y$ be a regular embedding of codimension s, with normal bundle $\mathcal{N}_j$ and $\dim(Y) \leqslant d$. We have the cartesian blow-up diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{j}} & \widetilde{Y} \\ {\scriptstyle \varepsilon}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} \\ X & \xrightarrow[j]{} & Y, \end{array}$$

where $E = \mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{N}_j)$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\widetilde{j}} = \mathcal{O}(-1)$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \varepsilon^*\mathcal{N}_j/\mathcal{O}(-1)$, $\nu_1^{A,B}, \dots, \nu_{s-1}^{A,B}$ - be roots of $\mathcal{M}$, and $\zeta^{A,B}$ - be root of $\mathcal{O}(-1)$. Using the already proven (b_i), Proposition 2.7, the definition of $G_{\widetilde{Y}}$, Proposition 5.6,

and again (b_i) and Proposition 2.7, we obtain:

$$\pi^*G_Y\big(j_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\big)(\overline{z}^B)=G_{\widetilde{Y}}\big(\pi^*j_*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\big)(\overline{z}^B)=G_{\widetilde{Y}}\Big(\widetilde{j}_*(c^A_{r-1}(\mathcal{M})\cdot\varepsilon^*\gamma(\overline{z}^A))\Big)(\overline{z}^B)=$$

$$\widetilde{j}_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G_E\Big(y^A\cdot c^A_{r-1}(\mathcal{M})\cdot\varepsilon^*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\Big)\big(y^B=\widetilde{\zeta}^B,\overline{z}^B\big)\cdot\omega_t}{\widetilde{\zeta}^B\cdot t}=$$

$$\widetilde{j}_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G_E\Big(y^A\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{s-1}u^A_i\cdot\varepsilon^*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\Big)\big(y^B=\widetilde{\zeta}^B,u^B_i=\widetilde{\nu}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{s-1}},\overline{z}^B\big)\cdot\omega_t}{\widetilde{\zeta}^B\cdot t}=$$

$$\widetilde{j}_*\left(\prod_{i=1}^{s-1}\nu^B_i\cdot\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G_E\Big(y^A\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{s-1}u^A_i\cdot\varepsilon^*\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\Big)\big(y^B=\widetilde{\zeta}^B,u^B_i=\widetilde{\nu}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{s-1}},\overline{z}^B\big)\cdot\omega_t}{\widetilde{\zeta}^B\prod_{i=1}^{s-1}\widetilde{\nu}^B_i\cdot t}\right)=$$

$$\widetilde{j}_*\left(c^B_{s-1}(\mathcal{M})\cdot\varepsilon^*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G_X\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{s}v^A_i\cdot\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\Big)\big(v^B_i=\widetilde{\mu}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{s}},\overline{z}^B\big)\cdot\omega_t}{\prod_{i=1}^{s}\widetilde{\mu}^B_i\cdot t}\right)=$$

$$\pi^*j_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G_X\Big(\prod_{i=1}^{s}v^A_i\cdot\gamma(\overline{z}^A)\Big)\big(v^B_i=\widetilde{\mu}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{s}},\overline{z}^B\big)\cdot\omega_t}{\prod_{i=1}^{s}\widetilde{\mu}^B_i\cdot t}.$$

Now (b_{ii}) follows from the injectivity of π^*. □

We obtain an operation on $\mathbf{Sm_k}\times\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ satisfying in addition (b_{ii}). The fact that the restriction of it to $\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}\times\bullet$ coincides with the one to $\bullet\times\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}$ can be reduced with the help of the Discrete Taylor expansion to the case where respective power series are monomials. This latter case follows from (b_{ii}). So, our operation indeed extends the original transformation. The uniqueness follows from the uniqueness part of Proposition 5.18 and the following Riemann-Roch type statement (I formulate only the mono-operational case, the general one is an obvious extension):

Proposition 5.19 *Let $A^*\stackrel{G}{\to}B^*$ be some operation on $\mathbf{Sm_k}$. Then the composition*

$$\mathbf{Sm_k}\times\mathbb{P}\mathbf{roj}\xrightarrow{\prod}\mathbf{Sm_k}\ \underset{B^*}{\overset{A^*}{\Downarrow G}}\ Sets$$

satisfies (b_{ii}).

Proof: Since an arbitrary line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on Z is the restriction of the bundle $\mathcal{O}(1)_1\otimes\mathcal{O}(-1)_2$ via some map of Z to $(\mathbb{P}^\infty)^{\times 2}$, we obtain that, for $\lambda^A_i:=c^A_1(\mathcal{L}_i)$ and $x\in A^*(Z)$, one has:

$$G(x\cdot\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}\lambda^A_i)=G(x\cdot\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}z^A_i)(z^B_i=\lambda^B_i|_{i\in\overline{r}})$$

- cf. Proposition 5.6. Applying it to the regular embedding $X\stackrel{g}{\to}Z=\mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{N}\oplus\mathcal{O})$, with the normal bundle $\mathcal{N}$ whose Chern roots are $\lambda_i|_{i\in\overline{r}}$, we get:

$$G(g_*(u))=G\Big(\varepsilon^*(u)\cdot\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}\widetilde{\lambda}^A_i\Big)=G\Big(\varepsilon^*(u)\cdot\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}z^A_i\Big)\big(z^B_i=\widetilde{\lambda}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{r}}\big)=$$

$$\left(\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}\widetilde{\lambda}^B_i\right)\cdot\varepsilon^*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G\big(u\cdot\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}z^A_i\big)\big(z^B_i=\widetilde{\lambda}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{r}}\big)\omega_t}{\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}\widetilde{\lambda}^B_i\cdot t}=g_*\operatorname*{Res}_{t=0}\frac{G\big(u\cdot\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}z^A_i\big)\big(z^B_i=\widetilde{\lambda}^B_i|_{i\in\overline{r}}\big)\omega_t}{\prod_{i\in\overline{r}}\widetilde{\lambda}^B_i\cdot t},$$

where $Z \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X$ is the natural projection, $\widetilde{\lambda}^C = t +_C \lambda^C$ and $t = c_1(\mathcal{O}(1))$. So we obtain the statement for this case.

For an arbitrary regular embedding $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ we use the deformation to the normal cone construction. We have varieties $\widetilde{W} = Bl_{X\times\{0\}\subset Y\times\mathbb{A}^1}$, $\widetilde{X} = X \times \mathbb{A}^1$, $W_0 = \mathbb{P}_X(\mathcal{N}_f \oplus \mathcal{O})$, $W_1 = Y \times \{1\}$ with natural projections: $\widetilde{X} \xrightarrow{p} X$ and $\widetilde{W} \xrightarrow{\pi} Y$. These fit into the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} W_0 & \xrightarrow{i_0} & \widetilde{W} & \xleftarrow{i_1} & W_1 \\ {\scriptstyle g}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle h} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle f} \\ X & \xrightarrow[j_0]{} & \widetilde{X} & \xleftarrow[j_1]{} & X \end{array}$$

with both squares transversal cartesian. Then $G(g_*(u)) = g_*(v)$, where v is given by the above formula. Since B^* satisfies (LOC) axiom, we have that $G(h_*p^*(u)) = h_*(x)$, for some $x \in B^*(\widetilde{X})$. On the other hand,

$$G(g_*(u)) = G(g_*j_0^*p^*(u)) = G(i_0^*h_*p^*(u)) = i_0^*G(h_*p^*(u)).$$

Thus, $g_*(v) = i_0^*h_*(x) = g_*j_0^*(x)$, and since g_* is injective and j_0^* is an isomorphism, we obtain that $x = p^*(v)$. Hence,

$$G(f_*(u)) = G(f_*j_1^*p^*(u)) = G(i_1^*h_*p^*(u)) = i_1^*G(h_*p^*(u)) = \pi_*h_*p^*(v) = f_*(v),$$

and we are done. □

This finishes the proof of Theorems 5.1 and 5.2.

6 Non-additive Symmetric operations

The current article was motivated by the desire to construct the last remaining, the 0-th *Symmetric operation*, for all prime numbers. In contrast to all other Symmetric operations this one is non-additive. The idea that such an operation should exist comes from the $p = 2$ case where it was produced (together with all others) by an explicit geometric construction - see [12] long before the case of an add p could be approached.

Symmetric operations are related to Steenrod operations of Quillen's type in Ω^*. The *Total Steenrod operation* $(mod\, p)$

$$\Omega^* \xrightarrow{St(\overline{i})} \Omega^*[\mathbf{i}^{-1}][[t]][t^{-1}]$$

is a multiplicative operation, whose *inverse Todd genus* is given by the formula:

$$\gamma_{St(\overline{i})}(x) = x\prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(x +_\Omega [i_j] \cdot_\Omega t),$$

where $\{i_j|_{j=1,\dots,p-1}\}$ is some choice of representatives of non-zero cosets $(mod\, p)$, and $\mathbf{i}$ is their product.

Let $\square^p$ denote the operation of the p-th power (a non-additive operation). Then it appears that the part of $(\square^p - St(\overline{i}))$ corresponding to the non-positive powers of t is divisible by the *formal* $[p] = \frac{p\cdot_\Omega t}{t}$. Using our main result Theorem 5.1 we prove in [14, Theorem 7.1] that one can divide canonically and get the *Total Symmetric operation* for a given p:

Theorem 6.1 *There is unique operation* $\Phi(\overline{i}) : \Omega^* \to \Omega^*[\mathbf{i}^{-1}][t^{-1}]$, *for which:*

$$(\square^p - St(\overline{i}) - [p] \cdot \Phi(\overline{i})) : \Omega^* \to \Omega^*[\mathbf{i}^{-1}][[t]]t.$$

Symmetric operations encode all p-primary divisibilities of characteristic numbers, and in a sense, plug the gap left by the *Hurewitz map* $\mathbb{L} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[b_1, b_2, \ldots]$. This permits to apply them to various questions related to torsion effects. In [11] they were applied to the problem of *field of definition* of the Chow group elements. In [15] we apply Theorem 6.1 to determine the structure of Algebraic Cobordism as a module over the Lazard ring. We prove in [15, Theorem 4.3] that $\Omega^*(X)$ has relations in positive codimensions. This extends the result of M.Levine-F.Morel claiming that the generators of this module are in non-negative codimensions. As an application we compute the Algebraic Cobordism ring of a curve. In all these statements the use of non-additive 0-th Symmetric operation Φ^{t^0} is essential as it permits to sharpen the results.

References

[1] S. Bloch, *Algebraic Cycles and Higher K-Theory*, Adv. in Math. **61** (1986), 267-304.

[2] H.Hironaka, *Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I,II*, Ann. of Math., (2) **79** (1964), 109-203; ibid. (2) **79** (1964), 205-326.

[3] M.Hoyois, *From Algebraic Cobordism to Motivic Cohomology*, arXiv:1210.7182 [math.AG] 29 April 2013, 40 pages.

[4] T. Kashiwabara, *Hopf rings and unstable operations*, J. of Pure and Applied Algebra **94**, 1994, 183-193

[5] M.Levine, *Comparison of cobordism theories*, J. Algebra **322** (2009), no. 9, 3291-3317.

[6] M. Levine, F. Morel, *Algebraic cobordism*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, 2007.

[7] F. Morel, V. Voevodsky, $\mathbb{A}^1$*-homotopy theory of schemes*, Publ. Math. IHES, **90** (1999), 45-143.

[8] I. Panin, *Oriented Cohomology Theories of Algebraic Varieties*, K-theory J., **30** (2003), 265-314.

[9] I. Panin, A. Smirnov, *Push-forwards in oriented cohomology theories of algebraic varieties*, K-theory preprint archive, 459, 2000. http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0459/

[10] A. Smirnov, *Orientations and transfers in cohomology of algebraic varieties*, St. Petersburg Math. J., **18**, n.2, (2007), 305-346.

[11] A.Vishik, *Generic points of quadrics and Chow groups*, Manuscripta Math, **122** (2007), No.3, 365-374.

[12] A. Vishik, *Symmetric operations in Algebraic Cobordism*, Adv. Math, **213** (2007), 489-552.

[13] A. Vishik, *Stable and Unstable Operations in Algebraic Cobordism*, arXiv:1209.5793 [math.AG], 25 Sep. 2012, 65 pages.

[14] A. Vishik, *Symmetric operations for all primes and Steenrod operations in Algebraic Cobordism*, arXiv:1309.5644 [math.AG], 22 Sep. 2013, 18 pages.

[15] A. Vishik, *Algebraic Cobordism as a module over the Lazard ring*, arXiv:1409:0156 [math.AG], 30 Aug. 2014, 8 pages.

[16] V. Voevodsky, *Triangulated categories of motives over a field*, in Cycles, transfers and motivic homology theories, Annals of Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press (2000), 87-137.

[17] V. Voevodsky, *Motivic cohomology with $\mathbb{Z}/2$-coefficients*, Publ. Math. IHES **98** (2003), 59-104.